

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be immediately notified.

#### THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. WALSH. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be forthwith notified.

#### THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. WALSH. I make the same request, that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be notified forthwith.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, November 9, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate November 5 (legislative day of October 25), 1943:

##### THE JUDICIARY

Elmo Pearce Lee, Sr., of Louisiana, to be United States circuit judge for the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, vice Hon. Rufus E. Foster, deceased.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 5 (legislative day of October 25), 1943:

##### IN THE NAVY

##### TEMPORARY SERVICE

Lawrence B. Richardson to be a rear admiral while serving as Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics.

##### To be rear admirals

Carl H. Jones	Ralph E. Davison
Samuel P. Ginder	Arthur D. Struble
Forrest P. Sherman	Timothy J. Keleher

##### To be commodores

Cortlandt C. Baughman	George H. Mills
Benjamin V. McCandlish	William M. Quigley
Campbell D. Edgar	Wallace B. Phillips
	James Fife, Jr.
	Byron McCandless

##### IN THE MARINE CORPS

##### APPOINTMENTS FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

##### To be major general

Henry L. Larsen

##### To be brigadier general

Graves B. Erskine

##### APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR SERVICE

##### To be second lieutenants

Stanley S. Nicolay	Ernest T. Savignano
Frederick W. Riggs, Jr.	Hugh W. Breakenridge
John W. Southworth	Robert "E" McDowell
John F. Paul	Jr.

#### POSTMASTERS

##### ARIZONA

Lucy H. Contreras, Bellemont.  
Nellie Moss, Marana.  
Lenore Hoopes, Sacatan.  
C. Herrold Higgins, San Carlos.

##### ARKANSAS

James A. Bruce, Garfield.

##### DELAWARE

Lena C. Poore, Hartly.  
Pauline M. Hamp, Hollyoak.  
Mattie J. Greenly, Lincoln.

##### IOWA

Edward Van Zante, Pella.

##### NEW JERSEY

Harry Marvin Riddle, Jr., Asbury.  
Anna T. Heus, Demarest.  
Rose F. Ricci, Murray Hill.  
Karl H. Schlupp, Westwood.

##### SOUTH DAKOTA

Ella Skorr, Colman.  
Hilda J. Gross, Doland.  
Iva M. Bowen, Egan.  
Gustave I. Honsey, Hecla.  
Anna Mellinger, Olivet.

##### VERMONT

Mabel M. Hemenway, Jeffersonville.  
Rosa M. Stewart, Tunbridge.  
Timothy J. Murphy, Windsor.

##### WEST VIRGINIA

Cora Fisher, Sabraton.

##### WYOMING

Carl W. Hornbeck, Shoshoni.  
John W. Powell, Superior.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1943

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.  
Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, in simplicity and sincerity we would thank Thee for the many blessings with which Thou dost fill our days. Thou art ever placing at our disposal the inexhaustible resources of Thy grace.

We rejoice in the noble heritage of freedom which is still ours because of the men and women who are responding so courageously to the call of God and country.

Grant that we may possess this heritage more worthily and strive with increasing tenacity of purpose and devotion to build a better world for our own and succeeding generations.

Hear us in the name of the Captain of our salvation. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Gov-

ernment," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments: Department of Agriculture. Department of War.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article appearing in the Boston Sunday Post of October 31, by Robert L. Norton.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by the Assistant Secretary of the Navy to the officer candidate graduating class at the Quantico marine base on Tuesday, November 2.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

(Mr. KUNKEL asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on sundry subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a bill of rights.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, following the address of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS], I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Dr. W. R. Stovall, medical director of the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

## FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

## (Roll No. 155)

Allen, Ill.	Gerlach	Mruk
Andrews	Gifford	Myers
Arends	Gillie	Newsome
Baldwin, Md.	Gore	Norton
Bates, Ky.	Grant, Ind.	O'Brien, Ill.
Bates, Mass.	Green	O'Connor
Bell	Gregory	O'Leary
Bland	Halleck	Peterson, Ga.
Boiton	Hébert	Pracht
Boren	Hendricks	Reed, Ill.
Boykin	Hess	Rees, Kans.
Brehm	Hoeven	Rizley
Brooks	Izac	Robison, Ky.
Buckley	Jackson	Sabath
Byrne	Jeffrey	Sadowski
Cannon, Fla.	Jennings	Sasser
Case	Johnson	Scanlon
Celler	J Leroy	Sheridan
Chapman	Johnson, Okla.	Short
Chenoweth	Johnson,	Sikes
Costello	Ward	Slaughter
Courtney	Jones	Smith,
Crosser	Kee	Maine
Cullen	Keefe	Smith, Va.
Curley	Kerr	Smith, W. Va.
Dawson	Kilburn	Spence
Dies	Lesinski	Starnes, Ala.
Dingell	Luce	Steagall
Douglas	McGranery	Sullivan
Drewry	McGregor	Taylor
Durham	McMillan	Thomas, N. J.
Elliott	McMurray	Vincent, Ky.
Elmer	McWilliams	Vorys, Ohio
Elston, Ohio	Maas	Weiss
Fernandez	Magnuson	Wheat
Fish	Martin, Iowa	Whelchel, Ga.
Fitzpatrick	Merritt	Wiley
Fogarty	Monroney	Winstead
Fulmer	Morrison, La.	Winter
Gallagher	Mott	Wolverton, N. J.

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and twelve Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

## ALLOWANCE TO WIDOW OF OFFICER OR ENLISTED MAN

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2188) to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, that does not affect the insurance policy?

Mr. MAY. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed the following conferees: Mr. MAY, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. SHORT.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two subjects and include certain statements and excerpts, and also an address by the Honorable Fred M. Vinson, and also a statement by Mr. Marvin Jones.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3598, with Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contested-election expenses: For payment to Luther Patrick, contestee, for expenses incurred in the contested-election case of Denison versus Patrick, as audited and recommended by the Committee on Elections No. 3, \$1,500, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, accurate information is essential to good legislation. To attempt to legislate

on erroneous data is to attempt to plot the course of a ship on uncharted seas by a faulty compass. Some statements were made on the floor yesterday, evidently under misapprehension as to the facts, and to keep the record straight and in order that the Members may be thoroughly informed, may I call attention to one or two such instances.

For example, there was the statement made by my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], that the Domestic Branch of O. W. I. sent out photographs of President Roosevelt and Mrs. Roosevelt to 239 Negro newspapers to be used in spreading political propaganda. I have looked into the matter and find that on October 15 photographs were sent, not to 239 Negro newspapers, but to 24, and that the photo was not the photo of President Roosevelt and Mrs. Roosevelt but was a photograph of President Roosevelt and President Elie Lescot of Haiti, who recently visited the United States, and that it was sent only at the request of the editors of those newspapers. Otherwise the gentleman's statement was correct.

Also, yesterday the distinguished gentleman from New York made a statement which is published in this morning's New York Times to the effect that the O. W. I. "was a stench when it was being administered by Mr. Archibald MacLeish under the Office of Facts and Figures." Apparently there was some misunderstanding on the part of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I would point out to him that this request is for the Overseas Branch of the Office of War Information, which prior to the creation of O. W. I. in June of last year was known as the Foreign Information Service of the Office of the Coordinator of Information. The O. C. I. was then under the direction of the distinguished Colonel, now General, Donovan. At no time has the overseas work had any connection whatsoever with the Office of Facts and Figures.

During the debate yesterday a statement was made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBY] that editors—unnamed and uncounted—of foreign-language newspapers in this country had made a 100-percent unanimous reply in 4 days to an undisclosed questionnaire attacking the effectiveness of O. W. I. propaganda overseas. In response to that statement, I place in the RECORD the names of American Ambassadors, Ministers, and chiefs of diplomatic missions abroad, who unquestionably are in better position than any foreign newspaper editors in this country to judge the effect of this foreign propaganda going over there and the importance and the desirability of the continuation of it by the O. W. I. Here are the names of those in the Diplomatic Service:

Ambassador Winant in England.  
Ambassador Hayes in Spain.  
Ambassador Steinhardt in Turkey.  
Ambassador Phillips in India.  
Former Ambassador Fish in Portugal.  
Counselor Gauss in China.  
Minister Johnson in Sweden.



Minister Kirk in Egypt.  
Minister Gray in Eire.  
Minister Morris in Iceland.  
Minister Wilson in Iraq.  
Consul General Wadsworth in Syria.  
Minister Harrison in Switzerland.  
Minister MacVeagh in South Africa.

Considerable emphasis was placed yesterday upon a statement to the effect that campaign buttons had been issued to the soldiers with political intent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We are told by the O. W. I. that absolutely no campaign buttons were issued at any time under any circumstances by anybody connected with the United States Government; that the service does not count-

nance in the least any political activity of any character. The charge might have had its origin in the fact that a small number of lapel clips had been distributed abroad as token gifts to less literate native populations, such as was discussed yesterday, tokens which have not only won the friendship of the local people whose friendship is exceedingly important under the circumstances, but which has familiarized them with American insignia, so that paratroopers, airmen, and other troops either intentionally or accidentally landing in the hinterland would meet with cooperation, sympathy, and friendship instead of hostility and opposition.

I include a list of insignia and the character of insignia issued.

Instead of the natives acquiring these lapel clips as souvenirs from the soldiers, the only ones known to have fallen into the hands of soldiers are those acquired as souvenirs from the natives:

Quantity	Language	Requested by—	Shipped
10,000	Arabic (shows Franklin D. Roosevelt and American flag).	Cairo.....	September 1942.
10,000	do.....	Baghdad.....	March 1943.
17,000	English and Arabic (shows Franklin D. Roosevelt and American flag).	Beirut (10,000).....	January 1943.
7,000	English and Portuguese (shows American and Portuguese flags).	Asmara (2,000).....	February 1943.
5,000	English (shows British and American flags).....	Baghdad (5,000).....	Do.
		State Department, for Cape Verde.....	Awaiting transportation.
		State Department for Fiji Islands.....	Do.

Also on yesterday, Mr. Chairman, reference was made to Mr. Alan Cranston, reflecting seriously upon him and his qualifications to serve in his present position. I have here a statement by Admiral McCullough, of the United States Navy, Security Officer of the O. W. I., in which he says:

In response to your inquiry, Mr. Alan Cranston was cleared by the Civil Service Commission September 3, 1942. There is nothing in the records of the Security Office which would warrant his termination.

Mr. Cranston is Chief of the Foreign Language Press Section, O. W. I. News Bureau, which supplies Government information to the foreign-language papers of this country. Prior to his employment by O. W. I. he was Washington representative of the Common Council for American Unity, a free-lance writer for the American Mercury and other magazines, and a United Press correspondent in Rome.

I make that statement in justice to Mr. Cranston, as well as in justice to the service.

Also yesterday, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], one of the ablest members of the committee, made the statement that O. W. I. had sent 7,000,000 pamphlets to Algiers since last March, with the inference that this use of O. W. I. funds had no direct military connection.

The facts are that there were over 7,000,000 pamphlets—almost 8,000,000—shipped to north Africa, but each and every one was shipped at the request of General Eisenhower.

Each and everyone of the nearly 8,000,000 pamphlets was shipped in valu-

able cargo space which might have been carrying military supplies, but General Eisenhower thought the pamphlets were sufficiently important to give them Army priorities for immediate shipment. Every pound of these pamphlets was requested by cable from Allied Force Headquarters and was carried to Algiers in Army ships by Army priorities.

The earlier shipments were designed for distribution in north Africa to the French and Arabs while it was important to make friends to insure that our supply lines and lines of communication were protected. A very large percentage of these pamphlets were in Italian and were distributed at the time of the landings on the beaches of Catania and Palermo and Reggio and Salerno and have since been distributed in Sicily and in Italy. I think this pretty well establishes the military importance of such pamphlets. You might be interested in some of the titles. They are:

Basic Facts About the U. S. A.  
Americans of Italian Origin.  
Message From Sicilian Americans to Sicilians.

Education for Death.  
Italian-American Friendship.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. There was no such inference as the gentleman suggests in the remarks which I made on the floor yesterday. The details were submitted to show the number of publications, moving-picture releases, and radio broadcasts that were being sent here and there in Europe. I specifically stated that the picture in other Allied

and neutral countries in which I was interested did not appear in the RECORD.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to hear the gentleman make that statement, because the inference on the part of any casual listener or reader would have been otherwise. I take it for granted then that the gentleman has no objection to our shipping this material to General Eisenhower upon his request.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have no objection to shipping it to General Eisenhower or General MacArthur or any other commanding officer overseas if he wants it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad the gentleman accepts their word to the purpose and effect of these expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, I merely make these corrections because I know that the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle are anxious to have accurate information on the activities covered by the bill. I take this opportunity to assure the gentleman who gave us this information that any forebodings which they may have entertained with reference to these matters are wholly without foundation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I asked the privilege of the gentleman yielding at this time in order to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if there was anything that I said on the floor of this House yesterday regarding Mr. Alan Cranston that is untrue.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. What was it that the gentleman said yesterday about Mr. Cranston?

Mr. BUSBEY. It is in the RECORD, if the gentleman wishes me to read it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. What does the gentleman think of Mr. Cranston? Is he satisfied with the services rendered to the Government?

Mr. BUSBEY. I made the statement in the RECORD yesterday, and I ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if there is anything in that statement that is untruthful.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The only thing in which we are interested here is whether or not the gentleman has any charges against Mr. Cranston. He singled him out yesterday and referred to him in a disparaging way. I would like to know if the gentleman is now satisfied with Mr. Cranston and his discharge of his official duties. What I had to say about Mr. Cranston I said yesterday and I still stand by the RECORD.

What is the gentleman's opinion of Mr. Cranston? If I have misquoted him I shall be glad to be corrected.

Mr. BUSBEY. I stated it yesterday.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Evidently what the gentleman stated yesterday does not agree with the report of the admiral of the United States Navy which I quoted this morning.

Mr. BUSBEY. I will be happy to read what I said for the gentleman if he will just be patient for a minute.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Since the gentleman does not remember what he said, is it possible it was someone else's opinion he expressed yesterday?

Mr. BUSBEY. It was my opinion, and I stand by it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further because I have a word or two I want to say. The gentleman may get some time of his own. I just want to say this: There may have been an inaccuracy in that statement with reference to the Negro press. My information was as I gave it to the House and I do not know any more about it than that. That was the information that was given to me by some of those people who received the documents.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman give the source of his information? Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. TABER. Not at this time. I am a little surprised at the frantic efforts the gentleman from Missouri is making to cover up the things that have been shown here about the O. W. I. I said that the Office of Facts and Figures was a stench. Is there anybody here in this House that would want to say it was not a stench, and that it was eliminated because President Roosevelt found that it was such a stench that he could not stand it any longer? I wonder, is there anybody who says it was not a stench?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman think it was not a stench?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The reason which the gentleman gave yesterday for considering it a stench he now says does not apply.

Mr. TABER. Oh, no; I am not taking back anything. Everything I said about that was true, and everything I said about the O. W. I. being a stench was true, and the American people know and they pretty well expressed it on Tuesday, that it was a stench.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Who was the head of the Domestic Branch who sent out the photographs?

Mr. TABER. Where? This year?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The photographs to these Negro newspapers.

Mr. TABER. The head of the Domestic Branch is a gentleman from Oregon. I believe his name is Hoyt.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Hoyt, former editor of the Portland Oregonian?

Mr. TABER. I am stating that when anybody operates the way that was operated it is a stench. Now that is all I have to say on the subject.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. But the gentleman does not give any reason why he considers it a stench. The reason he gave yesterday he now says is not true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further. I just want the gentleman to understand that it is sending out things now that ought not to be sent out—

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. What things? What is it sending out?

Mr. TABER. Such things as I described yesterday, such things as that. I have lots of them. The gentleman does not listen, or he does not understand; I do not know which. I showed the statements that they were making and sending out with reference to Negro housing. It has not been disputed and it was a stench.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. COX. I happen to know something about the record the O. W. I. has made. I did not hear the gentleman's speech on yesterday, but I read every word he said. I think he understated the case against the O. W. I. It is an aggregation of extreme left-wingers. It is just the sort of thing that the people last Tuesday in a number of States voted against, and it is just the sort of thing that the soldier is going to smash when he gets back home.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Georgia yield? The gentleman ought to yield for me to answer an unwarranted statement like that.

Mr. TABER. I cannot yield; Mr. Chairman, all I ask for is order.

Mr. Chairman, there has been altogether too much frantic effort to cover up this operation. I wonder if the House of Representatives ever heard of William L. Shirer? And if they have ever read any of his articles, a portion of which I shall read in a little while as to the way they have operated their set-up over across? I wonder if they have heard of these articles that have come out from Algiers through the Associated Press in the last couple of days with reference to the value of these things they are putting out? I wonder if they have paid attention to the director—

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield? Will the gentleman be more specific in his references? Will the gentleman read some of these articles?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield.

I wonder if they have paid attention—

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman ought to put them in the Record if he predicates his charges on them.

Mr. TABER. I will. I'm going to put them in the Record. The gentleman need not worry; it will get there quicker than he would like to see them.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Let us have them. The committee ought to have that information.

Mr. TABER. If I can get time enough I will put them in the Record. I have them here.

Here is one of them:

British Division of O. W. I. does much with little.

This is by Shirer. I have not the date of it here. It is a clipping out of the New York Herald Tribune:

Each month, for example, O. W. I. distributes to the regular British press service some seventy advance releases, official documents, and so forth, which are too long for the newspaper correspondents to handle. A surprising number of these are published in full in the local press, and they give the public here a background to American goings on which it would not otherwise have. All sorts of background information are dished out daily. The O. W. I. has not neglected the weekly papers. It is true that since the war the British public has been much better informed about American affairs although the paper shortage is reduced.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Why, that is a strong endorsement of the service.

Mr. TABER. I did not yield to the gentleman. When I get through we will let him have a chance.

It is the O. W. I. British Division in London—

I will leave that one out for the present. Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is not a criticism.

Mr. TABER. I did not yield to the gentleman. I will get you those.

The O. W. I. misses bus on Mussolini's fall.

This is by Shirer in the New York Tribune on the 11th of August. Shirer is the correspondent who was in Berlin for a long time. The O. W. I. broadcast at Mussolini's fall changes nothing in Italy. The Voice of America was telling Europe's millions, telling the Italians, Germans, and the occupied peoples that there is still no reason to believe that the essential nature of the Fascist regime in Italy has changed. An American commentator for O. W. I. was informing them that for the American people the resignation of Mussolini is welcome news, but it is not considered here to be an event of great importance.

That is what Shirer says, that is, "it is not an event of great importance." As Churchill was to say the next day:

Mussolini's end marks the close of an epoch in the life of Italy. The keystone of the Fascist arch has crumbled and without attempting to prophesy, it does not seem unlikely that any other Fascist edifice will fall to the ground in ruins.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is no reflection there.

Mr. TABER. On O. W. I.?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Nothing to warrant rejection of this appropriation.

Mr. TABER. I say it is a direct, deliberate reflection. They said they missed the boat. That is a reflection. They just missed the boat. If that is



not a reflection, what does the gentleman call it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know whether my understanding of the rules of the House is correct. Any time a Member seeks recognition he shall address the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's interpretation is correct.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Is my understanding also correct that when addressing the Chair in asking a Member to yield the Member has the right to yield or to refuse to yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I would like to address this further parliamentary inquiry. Does the chairman of the Appropriations Committee have any rights inherent to his office that do not accrue to the rest of the Members of the House? If not, I would like to see order maintained and I would like to have him stop his constant criticizing and heckling all the time during the balance of the debate.

The Clerk read as follows:

Stationery: For stationery for Representatives, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, for the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, fiscal years 1943 and 1944, \$600.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 22, strike out the word "second" and insert in lieu thereof the word "first."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is a clerical error.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION

For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, Office of War Information, fiscal year 1944, including the objects specified under this head and under "General provisions" pertaining to the Office for Emergency Management in the National War Agencies Appropriation Act, 1944, \$5,000,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for expenditure unless the Director of the Office of War Information, with the approval of the President, shall determine that such funds are necessary for carrying on activities in conjunction with actual or projected military operations: *Provided further*, That the last paragraph under the head "Office of War Information" in the National War Agencies Appropriation Act, 1944, shall not be construed to apply to supplementation by reverse lend-lease: *Provided further*, That the limitation on the appropriation for the Office of War Information for the fiscal year 1944 for printing and binding within the continental limits of the United States is hereby increased from \$1,400,000 to \$1,500,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER of New York: Page 5, line 8, after the figures "1944", strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$1,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation for the Office of War Information foreign service is \$29,000,000. The expenditures and obligations for the first 3 months were \$6,200,000. Four times \$6,200,000 equals \$24,800,000. That means that they have been spending at a rate which, if continued throughout the year, would leave a balance of \$4,200,000, and that without any additional funds whatever they are in a position to increase their expenditures for that service to a tune of \$1,400,000 each quarter, or nearly 25 percent of their expenditures for the first quarter. What does that mean? That means that they do not need at this time any additional funds on any basis that you may take whatever. It means that the O. W. I. has enough money if it is properly used to get along on, and carry on the work that needs to be done. They have 3,765 positions set up for their United States end of their foreign service, a number which is absolutely ridiculous, as compared with the number that are actually in the service, where they would be supposed to do some good in carrying on propaganda against the other countries. That means that we can do away with a great lot of the 3,765, who are in continental United States. Twelve hundred of them are in the school over on Long Island, and you know these people are not the ones that carry the main part of the load in this connection.

This whole set-up is under General McClure, in Italy and north Africa. It has been since December, when he went over there. The whole thing is coordinated, and this propaganda, under Maj. Gen. Fred Osborne, in the War Department. The O. W. I. is not in charge of this foreign propaganda. That appears clearly in the set-up and the hearings on page 1259 and page 1260. They only assign people to General McClure's unit in Italy and other places. It is not a set-up where they are the ones who are doing the job. It is clear who is doing the job.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I thought we voted to eliminate the Domestic Branch and that it was completely eliminated.

Mr. TABER. No.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. And yet I have had complaint from writers that there is some woman there who sends them books before they are published and she lets only a certain point of view be published, and if you publish something she does not like from her point of view, it is not published in the United States.

Mr. TABER. The O. W. I. domestic branch was given \$2,750,000 in the conference report. The Senate restored a very large amount, and that was the final result. It was the best deal that the House could make just before the recess. It was too much money. It was

more than they were able to use and use rightly, and they are doing things they ought not to do. But this is not an appropriation for that purpose, and only this \$29,000,000 that is available for the foreign service. We do need some foreign service of this kind, although frankly I think it would be much better if it is under the sole direction of the Army. Just to illustrate some of the things that they have had to do, they hired in this service a Mrs. Frederick Witt.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mrs. Witt is the wife of Commander Witt, of the Navy. She was hired to educate these boys who are hired by the O. W. I. to go over there. That is they did not know enough about the American Government, but that they had to be brought into Washington to look around and to be in the gallery of Congress, and told how the United States Government functions before they sent them over there. That is the kind of people they hired. When this thing was exposed by Mrs. Lombard, wife of a French general, they fired Mrs. Witt, but they moved the educational system over to the Marshall Field estate on Long Island, where they have increased the number from 600 to 1,200, which they now have. If they would hire people who knew something about the American system of government and not the kind of people who know nothing about it and do not appreciate it, it would not require all that set-up.

There was an Associated Press dispatch in the New York Times yesterday which I do not have in front of me, but which I have seen, from north Africa, indicating that our O. W. I. propaganda was not particularly desirable.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I cannot yield because I do not have the time.

Just a little while ago, Jack Benny returned from a tour of Italy. And he told us that the O. W. I. was not furnishing a great deal that was helpful; that the British were doing most of it. General McClure tells us that the number that the British were furnishing was much below the number that O. W. I. furnished, indicating the caliber of people they have been putting on.

Some of the generals have endorsed O. W. I. and told how valuable it was. Some of them have said it was really valuable. Others have said that they approved of its continuance. The cut which I propose to make would still leave \$5,200,000 available to O. W. I. above the first quarter rate of expenditures. That would mean a \$1,733,000 per quarter step-up. Is that not enough? That would leave them an opportunity to increase their operations \$5,200,000.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Why do we not strike all of it out?

Mr. TABER. Personally I would like to, but I have yielded to the sentiments of some who wanted to make a gesture of a million dollars toward this thing. Personally I think it ought not be given a cent, and if we were fair with the American taxpayers and just wanted to give them the money they needed, it would not be necessary to give them anything. But I am giving them a million dollars in this amendment, because I want to see a cut made, and I am compromising with my conscience, because I am afraid that this outfit that is running this thing will continue with ridiculous expenditures, away out of line, and that it will not be as effective as it would be if they would clean it up and get it straightened out.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Have the generals refused to take the money in the War Department and operate their own information service?

Mr. TABER. I think they have had pressure put on them to go along, operating to a large extent with personnel contributed by the O. W. I. I believe that we ought to get to the point where the generals would absolutely and completely control this picture.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman says that the generals had pressure put on them. Does the gentleman want to leave that remain in the RECORD, without knowing anything about it? Just let us be practical.

Mr. TABER. I have felt that that was the situation, that they had been told that they should take these people from the O. W. I., because I do not believe that the generals would want the type of people that, I understand, are being drawn in.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman want to let the statement stand, that our generals have responded to pressure on a war matter?

Mr. TABER. That does not mean that I know that pressure has been put on, but I do feel and my inference is that they have been told that they should take these people rather than that they have affirmatively asked for them.

Mr. McCORMACK. I can see where the gentleman might not agree with some individual or some policy, but to accuse the generals of being subject to pressure is a different proposition entirely.

Mr. TABER. I do not mean that I know they have been subject to pressure, but my inference from the operation and the effect of it is that they have been told that they should take these people and operate with them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could reach some agreement as to time on this amendment.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if those who would like to speak upon the question would stand so that we could get an idea of how many would like to speak and then we would be able to get some better judgment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Twenty Members have arisen. Would the gentleman be willing to agree upon 2 hours, the time to be controlled by the Chair?

Mr. TABER. I would think that would be fair.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. And the committee to have the last 10 minutes for the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Woodrum] to close.

Mr. TABER. That would be fair.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this amendment close in not to exceed 2 hours, the last 10 minutes to be retained by the committee for the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Woodrum].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITE. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the Chairman if this unanimous-consent request just goes to this particular amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is just for this amendment.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, since I propose to speak to the general bill and desire to have my time extended to 10 minutes, I withdraw from this group and will present my unanimous-consent request later.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that the debate that will come in these 2 hours will be confined to the amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I include that in my request, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that debate on this amendment continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be confined to the amendment, the last 10 minutes to be reserved to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Woodrum]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will read the names of those the Chair has listed as desiring to be heard on this amendment: Messrs. REED of New York, COFFEE, McCORMACK, WOODRUM of Virginia, O'NEAL, LUDLOW, SNYDER, CANNON of Missouri, JOHNSON of Oklahoma, FOLGER, DWORSHAK, VURSELL, BUSSEY, JUDD, DIRKSEN, WIGGLESWORTH, FORD, EBERHARTER, DITTER, LEMKE, and WILSON.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, just a word upon the importance of propaganda and its place in military campaigns. Organized propaganda has been one of the determining factors in all wars, ancient and modern.

In confirmation, may I read a brief excerpt from the official organ of the American Legion. This article is the story of the most successful soldier who ever lived, a man who lived more than 700 years ago, a general who never lost a battle and a conqueror who consolidated an

empire reaching across Asia and Europe from the Pacific Ocean to the North Sea.

Here is the quotation:

"Were the accounts of all battles, save only those of Genghis Khan, effaced from the pages of history \* \* \* the soldier would still possess a mine of untold wealth from which to extract nuggets of knowledge useful to molding an army." That was said by Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

The soldier, General MacArthur explains, cannot learn his profession solely by practice. Though weapons change, he must go to the past to acquire the unchanging fundamentals of the art of war. Nowhere can he find them better exemplified than in the career of the Emperor of the Mongols—700 years ago.

Genghis Khan's wars were half-won by propaganda before he put an army in the field. In the use of words as weapons no commander has surpassed this barbarian who couldn't read or write. His fifth column was the caravan merchants. Through them he hired agents in each country that he planned to attack. He studied the foe's geography, people, politics; he sought out disaffected elements and set one against another.

He also used propaganda as a weapon of terror. It was his regular practice to remind the country he planned to invade of the dreadful things that had happened to others who had resisted the Great Khan.

He used propaganda skillfully at home to build up morale. He extolled the soldier's profession, made it seem natural that all others should toil to keep the soldier in the field. He taught his people that the Mongols were a race apart, superior to all others. It was a phony theory, of course. The races, then as now, were of mixed descent.

So General MacArthur suggests a closer study of the great Mongol's conceptions of the "unvarying necessities of war." Separated from "the ghastly practices of his butcheries, his barbarism, and his ruthlessness, they stand revealed as kernels of eternal truth, as applicable today in our effort to produce an efficient army as they were 7 centuries ago."

In German there are five full-length technical studies of the military system of the great Mongol. In English there are only two or three brief works. It is obvious how much the Germans have learned from him.

And in this connection, and in further corroboration, Mr. Chairman, I now wish to quote from another article just off the press, showing how effectively the Germans themselves used this great weapon at the close of the last war. This is an excerpt from this month's Reader's Digest,

It is as follows:

Nothing like the German reparations swindle which followed the First World War has even been perpetrated in history. The story throws a high light upon the extent to which the world had grown used to letting itself be deceived by German propaganda.

Look at the case of the Saar coal mines, which the Allies took from Germany to compensate for the Germans' wanton flooding of the French coal mines—a dirty trick indulged in to paralyze French competition. In 1913 the German Finance Minister had valued these Saar mines at 300,000,000 gold marks, but when it came to reparations the Germans had the audacity to value them at 1,028,000,000 gold marks.

Did they get away with it? They got away with a great deal more, for in 1935 they got back the whole Saar state property, of which the mines were only a part, for 140,000,000 gold marks. Why this charity to tricksters? Because for 15 years the world has heard



about the poor Germans. Such was the power of German propaganda.

Yet such is the force of German propaganda that the world was persuaded that the whole Treaty of Versailles was indefensible, and that reparations had left the ruined Germany no alternative but to throw herself into the arms of Hitler. Few recall that reparations had been canceled a year before Hitler came into power.

All power of forming independent judgment had been beaten down by the sheer din and reiteration of German propaganda.

The incredible story cannot be concluded without mentioning the present war, in which the "swindler state" imposed on the nations that she conquered an annual contribution of 1,000,000,000 pounds in cash. This is four times as much, in one year, as the total amount of reparations that Germany had paid in cash in a dozen years after the last war.

In our midst a number of people are already organizing sympathy for post-war Germany.

Let us not be fooled again.

Mr. Chairman, the appropriation for propaganda carried in this bill is one of the most vital provisions for the war. Propaganda will turn the tide of war for the Allies as conclusively in this war as it turned the tide in favor of the Great Khan's hordes on the same battlefields 700 years ago. It will save men. It will hasten victory. It is desperately needed just at this time. We are reaching the crisis of the war. The next 2 months will decide the issue. We cannot afford for a mere cheese-paring \$5,000,000 to neglect the most potential weapon in our arsenal and delay for a single day the conclusion of a war costing billions of dollars every week. I trust the House will vote down the amendment and thereby hasten the close of the most dangerous and destructive war that has ever cursed mankind.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this is no time to get excited about an item in a bill of this nature. To me, this is serious, this is solemn, because this very day more than 200 of our boys will die on the distant battle fronts—that is the average—in order to give you and me the privilege of standing here in a democracy and defending the principles of democracy. So I cannot see how we can get excited. It is a solemn occasion.

Since we marked up this bill in the deficiency committee I had the privilege of talking to two officers who came from the north African and Sicilian battlefields. If I had not given my word to the committee that I would stand by \$5,000,000, I would offer an amendment here today to raise it to \$8,000,000. The big movements that will be made in the near future, which, of course, will mean the loss of lives, will need more propaganda of the kind that General McClure spoke of before the committee, two or three times as much propaganda of that nature as has been used in the past. They spoke of General McClure. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege and opportunity to know him as a man, my privilege when I was in England to have him escort me over England to the secret war installations. I know the high esteem in

which he is held as a Christian gentleman. General Eisenhower called him down to Africa personally and put this under him, and I was rather surprised at my friend from Illinois when he said that the general might have said it but somebody else said so and so. I do not think anybody within the sound of my voice who knows General McClure and General Eisenhower would say that they would say anything they did not believe. Let me read what General McClure said in response to a question:

Mr. SNYDER. Do you think that O. W. I., as it has been operated in north Africa, Sicily, and Italy since its inception, has saved the lives of American boys to any extent? If you did not have O. W. I., would there have been more lives lost, without the steps we have taken thus far?

General McClure. I can only state my opinion, and I would say, definitely, "Yes." Illustrative of that is the fact that a number of Axis soldiers, Italians and Germans, have come in and surrendered and used as their passes through the lines the leaflets we have dropped calling for their surrender. Using that instance only as an answer to your question, I should say the propaganda we have used there has kept a number of soldiers from shooting at us and thereby saved the lives of our own troops.

I happen to know that more than 8,000 Italians came up with those leaves and surrendered. These pamphlets were dropped behind their lines the evening before telling them what we would do, what was going on, and that it was better for them to surrender, that they would be taken care of, and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, this is too serious to quibble over a little sum like \$5,000,000 when we know it saves lives and that there is going to be more needed the next few months than there has been in the past. It is too serious not to give this amount of money. I know that if the many thousands of fathers of the boys at the front, the thousands of wives and the thousands of mothers throughout the Nation whose sons and husbands are at the front were here today, there is not one of them who would vote against this \$5,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I want to address myself to the subject of the Technical Training Center of the O. W. I. Under date of March 6, as is set forth in the hearings, under a press release the plans for a school to teach foreign outposts personnel the technical aspects of press, radio, and other information activities in the field were announced by the Office of War Information. A portion of the estate of Marshall Field at Huntington, Long Island, has been leased to the Government for the duration of the war at a rental of \$1. The instructors will be men on leave from outpost service or loaned by operating divisions of the Office of War Information. Approximately 40 students will be at the school at any one time, most of them studying for a 30-day period. Students will pay the cost of their maintenance.

What is wrong with that? One dollar rental and the students will pay the cost

of their maintenance. Why all the holy horror about it?

The cost to the Government, Office of War Information officials stated, will be considerably less than teaching facilities in New York City. So they move to this dollar-a-year home at Long Island. The curriculum of the school, it was explained, will concentrate on technical aspects. I will not read all of this, but I do want you to look at it on page 1339.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. No. I only have a short time.

Mr. DITTER. Just for one question?

Mr. RABAUT. Just for a question.

Mr. DITTER. Was that a release put out by O. W. I.?

Mr. RABAUT. It is for immediate release on Saturday, March 6.

Now, I take you over to page 1350 where I asked:

What is going to be the curriculum?

And there is set forth on page 1350 and page 1351 the names of the teachers and the subjects they will teach. What more do you want? No more honest proposition could have been put before this committee.

This morning there was a remark made about left-wingers, that the whole of the O. W. I. was full of left-wingers. Yesterday there was the innuendo of communism. I want to read to you from one of the most outstanding weekly publications in this country, edited by the Jesuits, the followers of St. Ignatius. The sun never sets on their labors. They are in every corner of the world and if any group opposes communism it is the Jesuit Order. What does the editor say in America?

In its editorial, under date of October 30, here is what they say.

It should not be necessary at this late date to insist that in the conduct of modern warfare words are at least as important as bullets. \* \* \* It should not be overlooked that the country is asking its chief propaganda organ, the Office of War Information, to fight the war of the air waves on little more than a shoestring. The 1943 appropriation for the foreign branch of O. W. I. amounts to not much more than the cost of the 60 bombers lost during the single raid on Schweinfurt!

This kind of economy \* \* \* is apt to be a very expensive mistake, since our failure to use effectively the weapon of psychological warfare can easily prolong the war and involve wholly unnecessary expenditures of men and money. That is a piddling sum for a Nation which is spending billions on armaments.

The matter is especially pertinent right now. O. W. I.'s foreign branch has about reached the end of its limited resources, and last week Elmer Davis \* \* \* had to go hat in hand to the Senate Appropriations Committee to beg for an additional \$5,000,000 to carry on critically essential work. Why there should be any haggling over this request is hard to see. If anything, it errs on the side of modesty and reasonableness. The pity is that Mr. Davis should have to plead for funds which in the long run may save billions of dollars and no one knows how many lives.

Do you question the necessity now?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.



The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, the previous speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] made a point regarding the Jesuit Order and its stand against communism. Every word he said regarding the Jesuit Order and their attitude is absolutely true and I commend them most highly for their stand. However, there was not one single word in his statement to the effect that the Jesuit Order has even approved the O. W. I. in their cooperation with Communist groups in this and foreign countries in order to get their propaganda across.

Yesterday the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] made the following statement. I quote:

But every person who is hired by the Office of War Information has to run the gamut of a series of grueling investigations, first by the Bureau of Investigation, then by the Civil Service and Intelligence Services of the Army and Navy, and finally by O. W. I.'s own Security Division. These investigations go into the most intimate details of personal history, affiliations, and habits of the applicant. A person of any taint or guilty of subversiveness could hardly come through that scorching fire of investigation without being exposed.

I quote from page 1056 of the hearings on appropriations for the national war agencies this past spring, as to the thoroughness of these investigations, the statement made by Mr. Vernon A. McGee, assistant director for management, O. W. I.:

The last report I had showed that there were 1,235 cases for complete investigation still pending before the Civil Service Commission.

I also wish to call to your attention, Mr. Chairman, the statement on page 1349 of the hearings on the bill before us today, in which it is stated by Mr. Philip C. Hamblet, Assistant Director, Overseas Branch of the O. W. I.:

It is estimated that the number of employees in which the Civil Service Commission has not completed investigations is 1,720.

I am sure that the gentleman from Indiana did not want to leave the impression with the House that before any of these men can go to work for O. W. I. they are so thoroughly investigated, as he said.

What happens—and this has been proven; and I made the point yesterday here on the floor—after an employee has been on the pay roll of the O. W. I. for a year, then they cannot be removed without specific charges being made before the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. There is a preliminary examination of every one of these employees before he ever goes into the service. I am so informed by the responsible officials of the O. W. I.

Mr. BUSBEY. I think the gentleman from Indiana would certainly agree with

me that a preliminary examination is not the "scorching fire of investigation" that the gentleman from Indiana described yesterday.

I have here an article that appeared in the Wednesday, November 3, 1943, edition of the Daily Worker regarding a recent broadcast by John Vafiades, alias John Burns. This man was convicted in 1940 by Federal Judge Henry W. Gaddola in New York to 2 years' imprisonment for the obstruction of justice by influencing witnesses in antitrust proceedings against the Communist-controlled International Fur and Leather Workers Union. This is borne out by the Daily Worker of July 12, 1940, pages 1 and 3; July 13, 1940, pages 1, 3; and the November 5 issue of the Daily Worker on page 3. This man John Vafiades is known as a Communist Party member, and I think his immigration status should be investigated.

The article states, in part:

The United States Office of War Information made its facilities available to Mr. Vafiades, so that he could greet the Greek people in the name of Greek-American anti-Fascists and encourage the Greek underground movement against the Nazi tyrants.

"We Greek workers in the United States . . . are following your example in unity behind our Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt," he told his countrymen.

"We are trying to be your equals in a National Liberation front against Nazi-fascism, in our efforts to obtain closer unity in our ranks for a full and final victory and for a lasting creative, democratic, people's peace."

The average American citizen would not think the wording of this last paragraph had any particular significance, but one who has studied the technique, phraseology, and Communist policy would readily understand what Mr. Vafiades had in mind. When he says "We are trying to be your equals in a National Liberation front against Nazi-fascism" he is really saying that the Communists of this country are doing everything possible to cooperate with the Communists of other countries, because all through Europe the Communists are forming Liberation fronts. And where he refers to a people's peace, in reality he means a peace favorable to the Communist Party in every country. The Communists in all their writings and speeches are getting away from using the word "Communist" more and more, and substituting the words "people's," "workers," and "democracy" instead.

This trend in the Communist Party of the United States is reflected in the action of the recent convention of the Young Communist League in New York City, when they changed their name to the American Youth for Democracy.

I predict that in the very near future, possibly within the next year, the Communist Party of America will change its name to some other title and substitute either "people's," "workers," or "democracy," instead of Communist. Because so many people in speaking of our Government refer to it as a democracy, instead of a republic, the Communists are beginning to take advantage of this inaccuracy to confuse the people.

A great deal has been said during this debate regarding letters and telegrams received from generals of the Army. To me, it is very significant that no information has been given us regarding the exact circumstances under which these letters were written. I am wondering if by chance the writing of these letters might have been suggested by someone in high office. There is nothing in the record to the effect that anyone, at any time, in the War or Navy Departments, requested that the Office of War Information be established to assist them in winning the war. As a matter of fact, everyone knows that the Office of War Information was set up under a Presidential directive, and this agency has repeatedly used the facilities of its office for propaganda that does not in any way help in the winning of the war. This activity on the part of O. W. I. is resented by countless parents who have boys at the front ready to make the supreme sacrifice for their country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, if misleading information were argument and its reiteration proof, the case against the O. W. I. would be definitely closed. The usual red-baiting charges are promiscuously disseminated in the Chamber reflecting on the patriotism and the Americanism of the self-sacrificing members of the talented staff of that great organization. Derision, ridicule, and personal defamation of personnel are inept and inefficacious arguments.

At the head of the Pacific Branch is one of the greatest students of oriental culture living in the world today, Mr. Owen Lattimore, whose integrity and Americanism are beyond question. No man should attempt to impugn the integrity or loyalty of that distinguished traveler and scholar and feel he can do so with impunity.

The Director of the Overseas Branch of the O. W. I. is Dr. Robert Sherwood, three times Pulitzer Prize winner, and one of the most gifted authors and playwrights living in the world today.

The head of the Domestic Branch of the O. W. I. is Mr. Palmer Hoyt, managing editor of the Portland Oregonian, whom we on the Pacific coast regard as the outstanding Republican publicist in that area. He is one of the leaders of the Republican Party, a man who directs the operations of the O. W. I. domestically in the United States.

As an example of the kind of attacks that have been launched against O. W. I., I have here a column by John O'Donnell published in the Washington Times-Herald on Tuesday, November 2, 1943.

Mr. O'Donnell starts out by saying:

Mr. Elmer Davis' Office of War Information has taken up the problem of India in a serious fashion—so seriously, in fact, that their broadcasts on F. D. R.'s program of freedom from want to the famine-stricken terrain of Calcutta is causing both irritation on Capitol Hill and a bit of eyebrow raising from Great Britain.



Mr. O'Donnell goes on to say that O. W. I. has overspent its budget on such items as 15,000 short-wave receiving sets for India to enable the Indian people to listen to O. W. I.'s broadcasts about the "four freedoms." Mr. O'Donnell also accuses O. W. I. of "horning into the India political problem without invitation."

Mr. O'Donnell states that O. W. I. has launched its psychological assault on India by displaying posters of a Christian religious nature.

Having read Mr. O'Donnell's blast at O. W. I.—with charges which, if true, would be serious, indeed—I have taken the trouble to look into this matter, and I am in a position to report the following revealing facts:

First. O. W. I. is not doing any broadcasting to India whatsoever either in the English language or in any of the many native Indian dialects. The truth of the matter is that there is no short-wave radio transmitter in this country powerful enough to reach India.

That disposes of the first of Mr. O'Donnell's charges.

Second. O. W. I. has not purchased 15,000 short-wave receiving sets for India. O. W. I. has not purchased any receiving sets for India, although it has sent there perhaps three or four small sets for the use of its own representatives in listening to Japanese broadcasts so as to be constantly aware of what the enemy is saying to India.

This disposes of the second of Mr. O'Donnell's charges.

Third. O. W. I. did not go into India uninvited. It was specifically invited to start an American information program in India, the invitation coming from the British Government in London and the Government of India in New Delhi. In India today O. W. I. is working in closest cooperation with our own American diplomatic and military representatives there, and they have praised highly the work that O. W. I. is doing.

That disposes of the third of Mr. O'Donnell's charges.

Fourth. O. W. I. has never displayed in India any posters of a Christian religious nature. Some such posters as those described by Mr. O'Donnell were shipped by mistake to India—but that was before O. W. I. was formed—before Mr. Elmer Davis had ever entered the service of this Government. By the time those few posters reached the port of Karachi in India, O. W. I. had been established and was on the job there. O. W. I. men in India were responsible for stopping the issuance of those posters.

That disposes of the fourth of Mr. O'Donnell's charges.

Now, I do not know from what source Mr. O'Donnell obtained this information. I assume he believed it to be true and factual, otherwise he would not have published it. But I suggest that he should think twice before he believes any further information from the same source which provided him with these completely false and insupportable accusations against O. W. I.

Incidentally, Mr. O'Donnell may be interested to know that his column is read with utmost interest in Tokyo. On Wednesday, November 3—the day after

the column referred to was published—it was quoted on the Japanese radio which stated, and I quote.

The propaganda of the United States Office of War Information was severely criticized by the well-known correspondent, John O'Donnell, particularly in regard to the situation in India.

The Japanese broadcasters showed particular relish in their quotations of Mr. O'Donnell's remarks about how O. W. I. is broadcasting a message of freedom from want to the starving millions of India.

It seems to me that an American columnist should not put himself in the position of writing false propaganda for the Japanese to broadcast. Let them make up their own lies without help from us.

There is plenty of food for thought for all of us in this particular case. On Tuesday a column by John O'Donnell is published in the Washington Times-Herald. That column is read by a Japanese agent in this country who flashes the text of it to Tokyo. We do not know by what secret radio that news was flashed—but it got to Tokyo all right—and within 24 hours the Japanese are broadcasting that same column back to us over their own radio.

In other words, the enemy is here in our midst. The enemy is reading lies about our Government published in America's free press. And the enemy is broadcasting those same lies on his own radio as his own propaganda.

I most earnestly draw this matter to the attention of our Army Intelligence, Navy Intelligence, and the F. B. I.

It seems to me it is time that we should give pause before we spread propaganda based upon false information.

I trust the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] will be rejected.

Denial of funds requisite to the efficient functioning of the agency promoting psychological warfare is a step which inevitably impedes the war program. While prodigal with funds for dubious extrabellum purposes, we illogically here are confronted with a serious plan to eviscerate the organization marshaling the shock troops of the printed word and the radio.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] for 5 minutes.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to have to disagree with my esteemed colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] on whose leadership and judgment in matters of appropriations I depend a great deal. I voted in June to reduce the appropriations for the Domestic Branch of the O. W. I., because I felt that propaganda was not in order here at home. I believe the American people are quite able to make their decisions regarding the war or anything else, on the basis of straight information; and I thought a lot of the output of the Domestic Branch of the O. W. I. was not information, but propaganda.

However, I believe strongly that in the winning of this war at the earliest moment and with a minimum cost in life and money foreign propaganda is an invaluable weapon.

Further I am sure that those who vote this afternoon to cut down this appropriation from \$5,000,000 to \$1,000,000 will vote that way not because they are opposed to foreign propaganda but only because they believe a lot of the propaganda being sent out at present is of the wrong sort, is not achieving the thing they believe ought to be done, and in fact, may be doing more harm than no propaganda at all.

I want to say further that I have no sympathy with any attempt to sell abroad the so-called American way of life. I have seen the results of many such attempts in the past in China. For example, a great American foundation came to China and observed that the Chinese ought to have better medical care. It assumed that, of course, the way to do it would be to give the Chinese a demonstration of how it is done in America. They built a medical school on the scale of that at Harvard or Johns Hopkins, so far beyond anything the Chinese themselves can support in this century that the net result was to discourage, rather than encourage, them. If western medicine had to be on so grand a scale as that, then the Chinese could only throw up their hands in hopelessness. It was like asking people to go at one jump from the kindergarten to the Ph. D. standard without having gone through the grade school, the high school, the college or university stages. Instead of putting \$7,000,000 into one American-type school in one city, and as a result training Chinese boys to practice, not in their own countryside, but only in that one school or in America, it would have been far more useful to put \$1,000,000 into each of seven less pretentious schools, scattered over China.

It is the wrong type of propaganda to assume that the American way of life is best for people everywhere, or attainable in any near future. It emphasizes the differences between peoples, and always to the disadvantage of our allies. Our purpose should be to emphasize the things we have in common—our principles and goals in this war, rather than our superior material standards in America. To tantalize tortured people by dangling before their eyes goals they cannot possibly reach in this generation is not good propaganda, or good judgment, or even decent human kindness.

Having said all that, it seems clear one should base his vote on whether he believes the propaganda being sent out by the O. W. I. to our enemies, our allies, and the neutral countries is on the whole of the right sort or not, whether it is efficient and effective. Well, we now have two main fronts—in Asia and in the Mediterranean. I happen to know something about the propaganda program in the first, particularly in China, and aimed at the Philippines, Indochina, Thailand, Burma, Japan, and so forth. It has been, I believe, very well handled. During the first 6 months to a year after Pearl Harbor, about all we had to hold the confidence of our allies in the Pacific was propaganda. The Japanese claimed that they had sunk our Pacific navy, and they had. They said that America and England were finished. What was the



use of the Filipinos or the Javanese or the Burmese or the Indochinese or the people of China hanging on? The only peoples on whom they could hope for deliverance were being steadily driven farther away. America could never come back, and so on.

The O. W. I. did a good job in convincing them that America would come back, hammering away on our ability to make planes, to launch ships, to produce steel, to grow food, to build up an unbeatable industrial and military machine. If that is what is meant by selling the American way of life, it was eminently worth doing.

Now we are getting victories to vindicate their faith in us, and our propaganda agencies in China are turning more attention to Japan.

I have no illusions that propaganda by itself can ever weaken Japan's war effort. Only crushing defeats can do that. But propaganda can be of enormous assistance when those defeats begin, if we are in a position immediately to exploit them to the full. I suspect that the Japanese can be made to crack up terribly, even more spectacularly than the Germans did last time or than they will this time, I hope. The Japanese have never been defeated. No one can be sure what they will do. We should be building up, not contracting, our propaganda agencies in the Pacific in order to be able to take quick and full advantage of the first breaks that come. That is merely good judgment.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. In a moment if I have time. With regard to the other front, I have no direct knowledge and must base my vote on the views of those who should know best, the military commanders there. On page 1263 of the hearings Mr. Robert Sherwood, the Director of Overseas Operations Branch of the O. W. I., stated:

I beg leave to give you a few figures on our required expansion in north Africa alone during recent months:

On April 1 of this year, when I was in north Africa, we had 32 O. W. I. employees there. The total pay roll was \$202,500, which included foreign-service allowances.

Today we have 160 American employees in or on the way to north Africa, Sicily, and southern Italy with a total pay roll, including foreign-service allowances, of very close to a million dollars.

The demands from that theater for more personnel continue constantly. We now have an order of 83 additional people, and we know that at least 100 more will be required. It must be remembered that every individual we send is sent at the request of General Eisenhower and General McClure. Every one of them has the approval of the State Department and War Department.

Since April 1, 1943, O. W. I. has shipped to north Africa from New York alone, with the approval of the War Department, 900 tons of paper, 7,703,343 publications; 7,500 reels of motion pictures; 302 tons of radio parts; 180 tons of printing presses, office supplies, recordings, and other equipment.

Orders from General Eisenhower's headquarters for 12 additional radio transmitters for that theater are now being filled.

Every ounce of material that we send, as well as every individual, whether by ship or airplane, must be authorized by General Eisenhower's headquarters.

Mr. Chairman, if General Eisenhower believes that the O. W. I.'s work in that theater of war is sufficiently important to make such requests and to assign it that amount of greatly needed tonnage, then I think it is important that we grant the relatively small amount of funds indicated. I hope the suggested reduction in the appropriation will not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, our friend the lovable gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has a very fine mind, a very logical mind, but to save my life I cannot understand the operation of his mind in this instance. He said in the Well of this House today and yesterday and on other occasions that the Office of War Information is a stench in the nostrils of the American people. Now in reducing the appropriation from \$5,000,000 to \$1,000,000 he places himself in the attitude of saying that a stench is out of the question, but that one-fifth of a stench is all right. The gentleman has said time and again, as have other Members on his side in proposing this appropriation, that there is plenty of money to carry on the activities of the Office of War Information.

If that is so, why give them a million dollars? It seems to me the gentleman would have been in a more consistent position if he had offered an amendment to strike out all the appropriation and not give them a cent. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is a great man and a great public servant, and I think he is usually right in respect to appropriations, but he is not always right and, in my opinion, in this instance he is as wrong as any man could be.

The gentleman from North Dakota asked me yesterday if I thought the bill as presented would take care of all of the essential activities of the Government. I told him that I felt sure it would; that it would not cripple any essential activity; but I want to say if this amendment is adopted, I will withdraw that assertion, because in my opinion it would vitally cripple one of the most vital of our activities, in fact the outstanding vital activity; that is, the war effort. At the expense of being repetitious, I should like to quote again today what I quoted yesterday as to what some of the leading generals who are in charge of the war effort think of the Office of War Information.

I should like for you again to ponder over what General Marshall said. On November 22, 1942, General Marshall writing to Mr. Davis, Director of War Information, said:

The efficiency with which the personnel of the Office of War Information cooperated with the War Department in connection with the operation in north Africa contributed directly toward its success and is deeply appreciated.

On March 30, 1943, General Marshall, again writing to Mr. Davis, said:

I desire to express my appreciation to the members of your organization for their excellent work in the field of psychological warfare during the Sicilian campaign.

The RECORD is full of expressions of faith and commendation from the top

generals of the Army. I shall not at this time read others. But I should like to say that I think we are taking on a great responsibility and we are encountering very great danger and hampering the war effort and contributing toward the possibility of the loss of lives and the defeat of our armies if we cut down this appropriation as proposed in the gentleman's amendment.

In conclusion I should like to call attention to the fiscal status of O. W. I. in the light of this proposed amendment. The appropriation for O. W. I. for the present fiscal year is \$24,000,000. Already one-third of the fiscal year has elapsed and approximately one-third of the appropriation, \$8,000,000, has been obligated, leaving \$16,000,000 for the remainder of the year. If the \$4,000,000 cut provided in the Taber amendment should be required to be absorbed into the \$16,000,000, it would cut all other appropriations to \$12,000,000 for the remainder of the year. Bearing in mind also that an additional \$5,000,000 as shown by the testimony, may have to be provided for contingent military operations, and that this may have to be taken out of the \$12,000,000, there would be left only a meager sum of \$7,000,000 for all of the rest of the O. W. I. operation overseas.

Such whittling down of funds would not be economy. It would be crippling, demoralizing, and a terrific blow to our war effort, the extent of which, in the loss of lives of our men and possible prolongation of the struggle, cannot be foreseen and should not even be contemplated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I reckon it is not entirely a breach of rules and regulations to address you as "my friends." I do not mean to have you recall through that, the custom or habit of another, but I do it to preface what I am about to say in order that I may have you understand that I would not have what I propose to say leave too great a sting. I am astonished at this attempt to cripple a war activity. I must be truthful this once and say that I am not greatly disappointed, but I am grieved that in the Congress of the United States, when I occupy that position which compels me to forget, particularly in this day of war, death and soul sorrow, whether I am a Democrat or a Republican. It is a significance and a contemptible contemplation that I would resent and immediately deny if it were thrust at me, in forgetfulness of the high position that I occupy as a Member of the House of Representatives.

We are apparently willing and want to be commended, I suppose, for appropriating moneys to buy tanks and guns and airplanes and machinery of war and thereby say to the boys who are on the battlefields today and in the air and on the seas, "Take these and fight to the death, but I am going to cut down from \$5,000,000 to the pitiable sum of \$1,000,000 an appropriation that, if it has any tendency at all, is designed, calculated,



capable, and competent to save the lives of thousands of our own mothers' sons by telling the truth and letting the world know the truth, through the Office of War Information." Whether the Director of that agency be a Democrat or a Republican does not make a bit of difference to me. It does not make any difference to me whether Mr. Hoyt is a Democrat or a Republican.

I am somewhat grieved that debates go on on this vital, serious subject, as to whether we are entirely satisfied with the aesthetic tastes of the men who are undertaking to save the lives of our boys through the dissemination of war information, meeting the propaganda lies that are set on foot by our enemies.

It is too serious. I hope no political consideration will enter into this matter. I warn you, whether you be a Democrat, a Republican, or a member of some other party, that you are trifling with a serious and dangerous thing and that which interests you and me most is that it is trifling with the lives of our own boys; and it is also trifling with your politics a little, too.

Is there anyone so politically prejudiced that he cannot have confidence in the provision in this bill that this appropriation shall not be available for expenditure unless the Director of War Information, with the approval of the President, shall determine that such funds are necessary for carrying on activities in conjunction with actual or projected military operations? To me this is an assurance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I have been a little amused after listening to the debate on this bill for an hour or so. I hope anything I may have to say will not be branded as any desire on the part of myself or Members on the side of the House I represent as not being intensely interested in winning this war as speedily as possible.

Like many of the Members, I have only two sons and they are both in the service—one in the Army and one in the Navy. When I stepped into the House this morning I noticed a great array of stalwart debaters and leaders on the Democratic side. I noticed quite a heavy attendance over there and that struck me as being so different from what it has been for the last number of weeks that I rather raised a political eyebrow, thinking there was going to be some fireworks and some real debate here today. It gave me the thought that maybe there might be a little politics in this fight over the O. W. I. in which they were interested.

I came to Washington as a new Member, with the idea of leaving politics at home so long as it might affect in any way my best service to this House, to the district I represent, and to the Nation at large. I wish we could all do that. Maybe I have not, but I have tried, and will continue to try to do so, because the last Congress—the one preceding this—drafted and sent out to fight on the bat-

tlefields of the world some 10,000,000 men. They were taken away from their jobs, many of them lucrative, their ambitions in life were dashed to the ground, and certainly when that is done the Members of this House ought to try to exemplify something of the patriotism and the heroism of these young men who have been sent out by this Congress. If there ever was a time when the duty of the Members of this Congress should ring in their ears every day they enter this House—this the greatest legislative body in the world—it should be now, because we have passed on a tremendous responsibility to those young men who have gone out to maintain the freedom of this country. I doubt if many Members of Congress want to bring politics into the deliberations. Our responsibility on the home front is tremendous.

I am reminded that this bill called for something like \$1,200,000,000 when it was received by the Committee on Appropriations. The committee, making a fine record, cut it by something like a billion dollars—a world record. I am informed that when it came before the committee the item for O. W. I. called for \$5,000,000 for a further extension of the work of this organization, and I am informed the \$5,000,000 came out unscathed reported to the House. I am wondering if there is anything in the fact that this \$5,000,000 could have some political nerve centers hooked to it and that some of the people downtown may be interested in preserving it because they have propagandized the people of the country locally and the boys in the service all over the battle fronts of the world with propaganda useless, much of it, for winning the war. I am wondering if that has anything to do with the fight that is being made today to keep this \$5,000,000 intact.

The question before the Congress today is: Will we vote an additional appropriation of \$4,000,000 to the Office of War Information? Will we waste \$4,000,000 of the people's money? Let me break this down so you can understand what it means.

I represent a district in southern Illinois consisting of 10 counties. My people are patriotic; they want to win the war; they have put up with regimentation, rationing, and all of the necessary and many unnecessary restrictions. The businessmen have given their time in leading the war-loan drives, in scrap drives, and in everything to support the war. They have given up and sent into the military service some 15,000 of their sons and daughters in my district. They have oversubscribed, in every county, every war loan.

Let me show you how this unneeded waste of \$4,000,000 would affect their contribution to the last war loan. This \$4,000,000 represents the sum total of all the bonds bought in the Third War Loan by the people of 6 counties out of the 10 I represent if it were to fall on them alone. Of course, it is spread over the Nation affecting other people who are just as interested in economy as are the people in my district. I am supporting the amendment offered by Mr. TABER, the Republican minority leader, to cut this

appropriation from \$5,000,000 to \$1,000,000 because it is not needed, because it is a waste, and because I refuse to see as much money wasted as was taken from the people from 6 counties of the district of 10 counties which I represent.

We have just witnessed an election, the returns of which in New York, New Jersey, Philadelphia, and Kentucky show conclusively that the people are aroused at the waste and extravagance of this present administration. It is a mandate to the Members of this Congress who are their only direct representatives to stop this reckless waste of their money.

We have witnessed an election in which the radicals, the Reds, the Pinks, and the Communists seeking to keep regimentation and the New Deal fastened upon the American people have openly supported the New Deal crowd in every State where the election was held Tuesday of this week. And now we witness the New Deal leadership fighting to increase to the appropriations for Elmer Davis at the head of the Office of War Information, who was a Socialist first, left of the left wingers secondly, who graduated into the New Deal and now heads the Office of Propaganda for America wherein hundreds of people who are on his pay roll are openly accused of either being communistic now or having graduated from a background of communistic connections.

It is amazing to me that many of the fine men on the right side of the aisle seemingly will not learn that the American people are through with such waste on such a gang which is wasting their substance and who are violating the purpose and intent of the Office of War Information to propagandize the people of America and the people in foreign lands with such sentiments and ideas that are contrary to the American way of life and our constitutional concepts of government.

I wish the people of America who listened in so intently to the radio on Tuesday night over all the Nation hoping and praying that those States which were holding an election would turn back toward constitutional government and defeat the waste and extravagance of the New Deal could be sitting in the gallery today and witness almost the solid ranks of the Republicans of this Congress fighting to save them \$4,000,000 while on the other side of the aisle, leaders who do not believe in the policy they support are fighting for this extra appropriation of \$4,000,000 to the Office of War Information.

There is but one conclusion that can be drawn and that is they want to continue this vast network of channels of the air and of the press for political purposes to try to keep the New Deal in power.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to exchange in personalities nor to debate ancient history with my good friend and colleague from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who as Chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations has authorized the greatest public expenditures and has thus created the largest public debt this Nation and its overburdened taxpayers



have ever suffered. However, the gentleman has taken pains and has exhibited considerable excitement in an attempt to refute the cold evidence I have exhibited to the House to prove that the O. W. I. has been engaged in activities which cannot be justified by the greatest stretch of imagination.

The gentleman attempts to justify the distribution of thousands, indeed millions, of trinkets by the O. W. I. on the grounds that it worked to some extent in winning the friendship of the American Indian in the early days of this country and therefore should work in winning the friendship of the Indians who live in India and other kinds of people in all other nations of the world. I would respectfully point out that this is 1943, not 1492. I would respectfully suggest to the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] that the foreigners whose friendship we seek to win may not be so ignorant as the savages who inhabited this continent years ago. Indeed, it can hardly be argued with effectiveness by the gentlemen that the Italians are so ignorant that their friendship can be purchased with these trinkets. Yet, that is what the gentlemen are going before the taxpayers with as a justification for reaching down deeper in their pockets.

I have no objections to our Government making other peoples acquainted with what this country is. In fact, I think it is a good idea. But, as I stated in my speech in debating this appropriation bill yesterday, I want to see this country sold to other peoples in terms of our Constitution and Declaration of Independence and not in the terms of any one man, as the O. W. I. prefers to sell it, much to the disgust of informed people.

The gentlemen contend further that this sort of global boondoggling is justified because they say it saves lives. If this could be true I would be offering an amendment to increase this \$5,000,000 appropriation. But, I am disappointed that the gentlemen on the majority side of the isle are so naive as to believe that a campaign button with the President's picture on it can scare the enemy away and thus save the lives of American boys. Of course, the majority is still using the old worn-out stock argument that all the boondoggling they are for is necessary to the war effort and that to oppose it means opposing the war effort and sacrificing American lives. The absurdity of such an argument has been demonstrated better than I could demonstrate it by the contention of the gentleman from Missouri that these campaign buttons, which he and O. W. I. prefer to call lapel clips, have saved American lives. If this was true why does the gentleman not argue that we should at further expense to the taxpayers make more of these buttons and use them instead of drafting fathers?

The gentleman says that the Army wants these trinkets or knickknacks. He says that the generals are begging for them. Unfortunately, that does not appear in the hearings on the bill. When I pointed this out to the gentleman on

the floor he said that he did not like to publish information of this kind. Ah, now I suppose he thinks we have revealed some kind of a military secret which the American people should not know about. It is not a military secret but I can well understand why the committee does not want the people to know about it. I can well understand that though the hearings on this deficiency appropriation bill are contained in a volume of 1,634 pages no reference was made to that. If there is any American general who is begging for lapel clips with the President's picture on them I would like to know who he is. These clips or buttons have been distributed to American troops as well as to the ignorant savages the gentlemen refer to in India, Africa, and Italy. It is a good thing these ignorant savages can read or most of the O. W. I. literature would not be effective. They might not even know whose picture was on the buttons.

If in some of the jungle islands of the Pacific or elsewhere it is necessary for us to give a string of beads to gain acceptance of the theory of the "four freedoms," I have no objection to it. But let us put an end to this sham and pretense and secrecy about it. And let us put an end to the promotion of the political fortunes of any one man or political party in doing so. Let us advertise America as the land of the free and the home of the brave, and not as a novelty counter.

Let us preserve O. W. I. and the good work it has done, but not let this need obscure the proven fact that mistakes have been made which if eliminated would save our constituents money.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. FORD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York is, of course, in keeping with the philosophy of unintelligent economy that his party has consistently followed. I wish to paraphrase the old saw: "Penny-wise and pound-foolish" by saying that that amendment culling O. W. I.'s appropriation from five to one million is a classic example of the amended proverb, "Dollar-wise and human-life foolish." When I say "human life" I mean the lives of our gallant fighting forces on the world's battle fronts.

This sentiment has been characterized by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] as hysterical. If this is hysteria then I hope Congress as a body goes all out for hysteria.

To me it seems completely inconceivable that this House could, in spite of political partisanship, oppose this psychological effort, which, from evidence given by competent authorities has actually contributed to the war effort, by not only saving the lives of our fighting men, our fighting ships, but in addition thereto has actually enhanced our chances of victory by adding to our forces both military and naval, both ships and men.

I venture this assertion on the statement of five military officers who, I believe, are better able to appraise the

work of the O. W. I. as they have observed its results on the battle front than the arm chair admirals and generals here at home. I myself would not in good conscience risk one life on the fighting front to save a few paltry dollars on the home front, particularly after voting millions and billions for guns and ships and planes and tanks.

When we consider, Mr. Chairman, that it was the O. W. I. broadcast that brought in the Italian fleet, and I think this cannot be refuted, this is important. If we had to go out and fight that fleet we would have lost ships and men, we would have destroyed that fleet, and instead of having an asset that we can now use to release some of our ships for service in other war areas, we would have less ships and less men.

Prominent military authorities have said that the all-day-long broadcast of the O. W. I. succeeded in bringing those ships into Malta where they joined the United Nations forces.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be defeated because it represents to me a pinch-penny attempt to cripple one of the effective fighting forces that is now conducting our global war. If this does not smell to high heaven of rotten political chicanery, then I have never seen that type of activity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I have heard all of the debate yesterday and most of the debate today. In all the debate to which I have been privileged to listen nobody has denied the tremendous value of psychological warfare. Everybody, in fact, has admitted that the value of psychological warfare is equal to the value of warfare by force of arms, and I think the experiences of this war already have proven that in some instances the value of psychological warfare is greater than the value of warfare by force.

Up to the present time this Congress has not refused the armed forces of this country any request that they have made for funds. The Congress has gone down the line with every request made by the War Department, the Navy Department, the Merchant Marine, War Production Board, Shipping Board and every other agency of the Government that has something to do with trying to bring victory to the United Nations. Any attempt at this time to deny funds to the psychological branch would be, in my opinion, just as foolish as it would be to deny a commander on the battle front the munitions that he needed if such ammunition were available. Were we to deny \$4,000,000 which the psychological branch of the O. W. I. wants, we would be subject to just criticism were something to go wrong in the various theaters of operation. It would be just as unwise to deny a ship to the Navy if the Navy Department asked for one.

Those who are attacking the O. W. I. and who want to deny them this money should look at the hearings and their reports. Every general in command



overseas has signified either by cable or in writing the tremendous value that the psychological warfare has had in gaining victory; Pantelleria, in Sicily, in Italy, in North Africa and in every theater in which our forces have been engaged. The attack that is being made by some on the O. W. I. is merely a flank attack. It is a camouflage attack on the ground that perhaps some of the personnel in this psychological warfare branch are not loyal to the United States. The question now before us should be decided solely on the basis of its military value.

We cannot afford to take a chance at a critical time like this when we admit how valuable this type of warfare is. To cripple the O. W. I. would be taking a serious chance. I hope the members of this committee and the Congress will not approach this question from a political viewpoint because it appears to me that some are giving consideration first to the political aspect of getting victory for one side or the other. I trust that the Congress will consider this seriously. Give the commanders in chief what they want and also give the O. W. I. what they say is necessary and what the generals say is necessary.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. Does the gentleman remember that this House cut the appropriations on the domestic activities of O. W. I. this past summer?

Mr. EBERHARTER. That may be true. That is a domestic question.

Mr. PLOESER. Let me finish the question. Does the gentleman think this has done any injury to the war effort?

Mr. EBERHARTER. We have not had enough time to find out whether or not it has done any injury. No reports have been received, no investigation has been made, no committee has reported on it, and the country does not know, neither does this Congress. It may develop that very serious harm was done to the war effort by a denial of funds to the domestic branch of O. W. I.

Mr. PLOESER. Very serious harm was done to the political effort on the home front.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] for 5 minutes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, during the debate last evening on this particular issue some remarks were made by the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee which should be corrected and clarified at this time. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] said:

In the Overseas Branch everything is under the direct control of the Army officers. The program must be submitted, and it is made up by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It is at all times under the control of the military zone.

I called attention to a United Press dispatch which appeared in a local paper on October 24, reporting on the activities of a gentleman who happens to be mayor of Portland. All of the

Members probably recall his comments and his caustic criticism of five Members of the other body who had just returned from a global tour, during which they inspected the combat zones.

I should like to quote Mayor Riley in this dispatch as follows:

I've talked with generals and privates, I've talked with Johnnie, Jane, Mary, and Joe, people at the beaches. Nowhere did I find the slightest justification for charges made by the Senators. I'm not one of those people who sit around a hotel room and come up with all the answers.

This man Riley said that the British people know enough of America to understand that "Those men aren't talking for America. They can't tell the people what they think. They don't run the country. They are just Senators with a strange yen."

When I called the attention of the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to this newspaper dispatch, I asked him if he would have us infer that our military leaders in Europe approved of such political activity on the part of representatives of O. W. I.

Mr. CANNON's reply was:

In response to the gentleman from Idaho, I may say that that man is not a representative of O. W. I. at all, and has no connection whatever with it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Briefly.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Does the gentleman contend that this man is an employee of O. W. I.?

Mr. DWORSHAK. If the gentleman will just withhold his comment 1 second, I think I will answer the question.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. He has never been an employee of O. W. I.

Mr. DWORSHAK. At this time I should like to read from a letter I have received from Elmer Davis, Director of the O. W. I., dated October 30, 1943, in answer to an inquiry from me:

I am glad to reply to your letter of October 26, in which you ask whether this Office has been paying the expenses of Mayor Earl Riley, of Portland, Oreg., in England.

Mayor Riley is one of a small group of representative Americans who are in England for us to inform the British people at first hand about the American war effort. As in the cases of the other speakers, we pay Mayor Riley no compensation while he is on this mission, but we do pay his transportation expenses and a per diem of \$10 a day while he is in England.

Mayor Riley was invited jointly by the O. W. I. and the British Ministry of Information when Mayor Lausche, of Cleveland, who had been previously invited, was unable to make the trip.

That is a letter from the Director of the O. W. I.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Briefly.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman stated yesterday that Mayor Riley is a representative of the O. W. I.

Mr. DWORSHAK. What would the gentleman call it?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. He is not a representative of the O. W. I., he is merely one of a group who are guests of the O. W. I. on a trip. Nobody can

say a guest is a representative of the organization which is paying his expenses on a good-will trip. He is not an employee, he is not on the pay roll, and he has never received any salary from the O. W. I.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I decline to yield further, Mr. Chairman.

Certainly, the letter of Mr. Davis indicates that this particular individual represented the O. W. I., that his expenses were paid by O. W. I., and when he made those remarks in London the British people had a right to assume that he was reflecting the views of the American people.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DWORSHAK. No; I do not have the time.

I realize that my distinguished chairman wishes to repudiate activities like this.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is no more authorized to make a statement for me than Mayor Riley is authorized to represent O. W. I.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Idaho yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. DWORSHAK. No; I do not have the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho declines to yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Of course the gentleman wants to repudiate this man, who has done incalculable harm to the cause of winning this war by promoting disunity and dissension. When Mr. Davis points out that men of this kind are sent to England to inform the British people at first hand about the American war effort, certainly that is an insult and an affront to the hundreds of thousands of gallant young men and women wearing the uniform of our country who are serving in England and in other theaters of war. We have been unstinting in pouring out our treasure in behalf of the United Nations' war effort; yet we have the O. W. I. sending men like Mayor Riley to insult not only the men and women in the American uniform but all Americans. This surely cannot be considered smart psychological warfare.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, because the O. W. I. already has ample funds with which to sponsor legitimate activities.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY].

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I take it that the gentleman who preceded me feels, judging by the heat of his words, that the way to cure a toothache is to kill the patient.

One of the gentlemen of the opposition said on the floor here that the O. W. I. was not requested by any general but was created as a result of a Presidential directive. May I remind that gentleman and those who may go astray on this particular vote that the President who issued the directive is the Commander in Chief of all the Army.

To me, the intent of the opposition is obvious in this particular amendment.



Earlier in the year I made a protest against the abolition of the domestic activities of the O. W. I. For the past several weeks on the floor of the House I have heard Congressman after Congressman say that the people ought to be better informed on the war effort, that the people ought to know more about the war. It was this very Congress that by abolishing the Domestic Branch of the O. W. I. prevented the O. W. I. from telling the people more of the facts.

In my judgment, the attack on the domestic policies of the O. W. I. was nothing more or less than plain, ordinary, unadulterated politics. In my judgment, the attack which was made a few weeks ago on General Marshall's being promoted to the greatest position in the world as commander in chief of all the armies was nothing but politics. In my judgment, this particular amendment is nothing more nor less than politics.

During the last war one of the greatest strokes we made toward victory was President Wilson's Fourteen Points. At the present time one of the greatest strokes we are making is the spreading throughout the world the report of the Moscow Conference. When that particular report has to be spread throughout the world, the most effective agency we have for spreading it is the O. W. I. It seems to me a travesty to hear the able gentlemen of the opposition refer as his sources of authority to two comedians; one, Jack Benny, of the radio, and the other, John O'Donnell of the Washington Times-Herald.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I decline to yield; but I wish to refer to the gentleman's question put to the gentleman from Pennsylvania as to whether or not cutting down the domestic appropriation of O. W. I. hurt the war effort. I say, unquestionably and unqualifiedly, it did, for this reason: A lot of people of America have the assurance that this war is going to end by Christmas. If the people of America had the facts, we would have greater production, a greater war effort, and less of this smug complacency which is generated by such remarks as those made by the gentleman of the opposition.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. MURPHY. I now yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. For the gentleman's information, that he may be accurate, we did not abolish the Domestic Branch of the O. W. I. this summer. We did reduce it to an appropriation of approximately \$2,700,000.

Mr. MURPHY. I agree with the gentleman. We have Mr. Hoyt, who is doing a splendid job; but we cut down the appropriation so that we practically abolished its effectiveness by not giving it enough money to work with.

In my judgment, the real basis of this amendment is politics for 1944, at the cost of the war effort. The amendment should be defeated.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, we should not get very much excited about this amendment, but I do believe that every

man on the floor should think very conscientiously as to what he wants to do about it. There are a great many veterans on this floor, there are a great many men here who went through the last war in Europe. They saw there the effect, both by our own troops, and by the enemy, of psychological warfare. There is no question that it is one of the most potent weapons used in any war, and it has been used in this war most effectively by the Germans, the Japanese and by the Italians. It is recognized by military men and cannot be neglected. Yet you gentlemen must realize that the only agency, the only one that the American Army and the American Navy has today, for psychological warfare is the one provided for in this appropriation, and the amount that you are being asked to reduce, is the only money in any appropriation bill for the purpose of psychological warfare. By this amendment you are being asked here to say to the Army—and this is an Army activity—we do not want more than 20 percent of the psychological warfare that we have had heretofore. There is coming shortly after this request for a \$5,000,000 appropriation, another five million request, because as we secure additional captured territory, we enlarge our activities, and more money is needed. Where this money is to be used: One area, the European, is to get \$3,000,000; another one, \$1,000,000; another one, \$900,000; and another \$262,000, as set out in the hearings. That is all of the money that our people have to do this job in these theaters.

I wonder how many men here have read the testimony with respect to this. I think gentlemen ought to take the trouble to read it, they will find that this is the only money for psychological warfare and that it is badly needed. This is highly important work. It has the approval of General Eisenhower, General Patton, General McClure, and the other men there. It is a serious thing to reduce it. If you are mad at the O. W. I., if it has done something that you do not like, there is another way to get at them, but do not deny to General Marshall all of the money that he wants for the purpose of psychological warfare. If you read the testimony in the hearings you will see the effects of psychological warfare on the Italian and German prisoners. They have said as they came in that the leaflets and the broadcasts that came from the American Army through this agency were having a tremendous effect on the morale of the German soldiers, and that they realized that the end was coming closer. General Cunningham said that the activity of this agency had much to do with the surrender of the Italian ships to the American forces. You may create prejudice, you may make any sort of argument, but the fact remains, which I defy anyone to disprove, that the only money that the American Army has for psychological warfare is the money in this bill, and that a cut from \$5,000,000 is denying General Marshall and the Army the amount of money they need to conduct this important piece of work. Do not, because of prejudice, or

lack of having read the hearings, or lack of information, or listening to false information, vote to cut this down. This is an important work for the Army, and that cannot be denied.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of some who have entered into this debate, I call attention to a few facts. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY] awhile ago stated that we abolished the Domestic Branch of the O. W. I. In a brief interrogation I called his attention to the fact that it had not been abolished, but had been curtailed. For his information I call to his attention the fact that Mr. Palmer Hoyt, who is the head of the Domestic Branch of the O. W. I., said shortly after he had taken over that branch, that he had reduced the help by over 800 and thereby greatly improved the efficiency and the operations. All of this weak argument is in my opinion an effort to reestablish a political propaganda fund. Such argument is wholly false, because the Director of the Domestic Branch admits that by the forced reduction he has improved the service. The question now is on this additional \$5,000,000, which has been requested. It happens that the O. W. I. for the first 3 months of their fiscal year have expended less than their budget allowance and if they continue at the same rate for the remainder of the fiscal year they will have in their foreign funds a surplus of \$5,200,000. They can within any additional authorization increase their foreign staffs. If they wasted the money to the tune of \$15,000 per man, and they could increase it by 340 more people on annual basis or 461 more people on a basis of three-quarters of the fiscal year, or 9 months.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] awhile ago gave all the credit for whatever work had been done in China since Pearl Harbor to the O. W. I. It so happens that the O. W. I. was established in June 1942, 7 months after Pearl Harbor. I am inclined to believe he is greatly confused with the Office of Strategic Services, and that is not the subject under debate on this amendment.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield.

Mr. LUDLOW. The Overseas Branch was in existence long before O. W. I. was established and it was under General Donovan.

Mr. PLOESER. Well, that is the Office of Strategic Services. I said the O. W. I. was not established until June 1942, and that is the fact.

Mr. LUDLOW. The service was being rendered before that time, is the point I am making.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. By Mr. Robert Sherwood, under General Donovan, who is now conducting it under Elmer Davis.

Mr. PLOESER. The fact remains that, twist it as you will, O. W. I. was not rendering such service because there was not such a thing as O. W. I.

Mr. LUDLOW. The fact remains that the service was being rendered.



Mr. PLOESER. No one criticizes the service. No one is criticizing the Office of Strategic Service. No one is criticizing the departments of the Army or the Navy who can render very similar service. Indeed, if I were proposing this amendment I would have cut out the entire \$5,000,000, because I think the purpose is to carry on the same service described on this floor yesterday by my very able colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] which is pure political rot and waste, and designed more to influence our boys on foreign battlefields on how they might vote than in fighting a war to preserve their lives.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] has expired.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of heat engendered in the course of this debate. Much of the discussion seems to me entirely removed from the point at issue at this time.

The question before the House has nothing to do, as I see it, with the value of psychological warfare on the fighting fronts of this Nation. If you will read the letters that have been read again, and again, from various generals, you will find almost without exception that every one of those letters is devoted to the fine work which this agency has done on the fighting fronts. Of course, that work is invaluable. Of course, we are all for it. One reason it has been so effective is that at the fighting fronts it has been under the direction of our commanding generals.

I do not know a single member of the committee: I doubt if there is a single Member of this House who would deny to General MacArthur or General Eisenhower or Admiral Halsey or any of our commanding officers overseas \$1 of funds essential to prosecute psychological warfare on the fighting fronts. From my point of view all the discussion along this line has been entirely beside the point.

As I see this question, it is a cold-blooded, dispassionate question as to whether or not \$29,000,000, which we have already made available for the overseas branch of O. W. I. is adequate to take care of the needs overseas, including those at the fighting front. In my judgment, the \$29,000,000 at the present time is more than adequate.

I hold in my hand a letter from Elmer Davis dated October 25, 1943, in which he breaks down the expenditure to date of the Overseas Branch of O. W. I. into three classifications: In enemy countries, in neutral countries, and in Allied countries.

What does the statement show? It shows two things. First, that the overall expenditure for all three classes of countries for the first quarter of this year amounted to \$6,200,000 or thereabouts. Second, that the amount expended in neutral and Allied countries, entirely apart from the fighting fronts, amounted in the same period to \$3,300,000.

What does that mean? First. It means that on the basis of spending in the first quarter we are going to expend \$24,800,000 in all classes of countries, leaving a balance of almost \$5,000,000 to take care of the present request.

Second. It means that there is anticipated an expenditure of \$13,200,000 in the Allied and neutral countries, wholly apart from the fighting fronts.

In other words, O. W. I. now has a probable surplus of \$5,000,000, and in addition, some \$13,200,000, any part of which can be allocated to the fighting fronts tomorrow or the next day or whenever it is called for by our commanding generals.

There is a further item that should be mentioned. We are giving authority in this bill to O. W. I. to take advantage of reciprocal lend-lease aid. I am advised that aid of this character, which is already in sight, amounts to something over a million dollars a year. Very likely there will be more aid of this character which will come into play in the near future.

This is the entire picture, as I see it. We have provided enough money under present circumstances on the basis of the agency's own figures for all purposes.

In my judgment, the adoption of the pending amendment will not handicap the forces at the fighting fronts in any way whatsoever. If I thought that it would do so, I should be the last to support it.

I hope the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] has expired.

The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, it seemed to me as just one Member of Congress who sits here in this room trying constantly to acquire information, and trying to work out in his own mind what the right thing is to do about this appropriation, that we have reached a rather confused point, and I should like to record on the record one or two facts as I get them in my mind from the discussion.

I do not know anybody in this room who wishes completely to remove—and especially to remove suddenly—all of those services which are actual propaganda as a part of warfare. It is a peculiar thing, however, that those of us who have for any reason at all had to talk confidentially, and many times very much off the record, with people who have come back from the countries in which our propaganda agencies have worked, that these men are completely of the same opinion. They are unanimous on the fact that our policies are not successful—that is, completely successful—so far as the foreign division of O. W. I. is concerned, and I call the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], who spoke a few moments ago, to the fact that his statement that the O. W. I. is equally as effective as our armed forces cannot be so. I am sure that impression was not intended. Were we to carry it to a logical conclusion, we

would simply double the O. W. I. and reduce the size of the Army. There comes a time when propaganda warfare becomes ineffective and we must do some fighting. So the issue before us is not whether we shall have it or shall not have it in its entirety, but how much is necessary for what we should do. While, therefore, I may run the risk of putting on the record some things that have already been said, it seems to me that we should emphasize over and over again the fact that the appropriation not only gives the O. W. I. all that it needs—that is, with the adoption of the amendment—but actually gives the O. W. I. very much more than their own figures indicate that agency really needs. They have asked, as has been said, for 80 more people. We gave them an appropriation for some \$29,000,000, which they are only spending at the rate of \$2,000,000 a month, or about \$6,000,000 a quarter. They will not consume, at that rate, the whole of the original appropriation. No additional appropriation whatever is necessary, and I, for one, would be willing to vote for an amendment to cut this item out entirely. Congress is not going out of business. Congress is going to be here; Congress can at any time vote to give the O. W. I. a deficiency appropriation if it is necessary. There remains some \$24,800,000 in the former appropriation for this agency. They have sufficient on hand now to allow them to employ 461 more people, yet they have asked for only 80. It seems illogical to come here and ask for many times more than an agency needs when we are asking the people of the United States, who must carry this war, who must finance this war, to carry the heaviest debt that has ever been imposed upon the people of any country. It would in no way harm the O. W. I., according to any figures that have been presented to this Congress, to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. Certainly the Congress is not going out of business that rapidly, and I, for one, intend to vote for the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, we have heard much today to arouse the emotions and the passions. I want to get down to cold figures for, after all, this is a mathematical matter. No one on the minority side, no one on the majority side, who opposes the present request for \$5,000,000 is unmindful of the value of psychological warfare; we are not taking any exception to that; what we are taking exception to is the encouragement which will be given to an agency that has already established a record of profligacy to further moves along the same line. O. W. I. had \$29,000,000 for this operation under the regular appropriation. They have been spending for the first quarter at the rate of \$6,200,000, which means for the year \$24,800,000. This leaves \$4,200,000 as a balance at the end of the year. We give them a million dollars additional by this amendment, which means \$5,200,000. They say they need an expanded staff. I am going



to estimate that each one of this expanded group will consume \$15,000 in salary and expense. This would mean that the \$5,200,000 would permit O. W. I. to expand its staff by 346 new employees, or on a 9-month basis it would mean 461 additional employees. No matter what the demands may be for the expansion suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], no one can conceive that 461 will not be sufficient to carry on the work. So it is a matter of permitting O. W. I. to establish its own spending program or keeping it in line with what the Congress wants done. The issue resolves itself into the simple question, Shall the Congress surrender its right to determine the amount necessary for a Government activity?

Of course, you will give O. W. I. the \$5,000,000 if you believe that an agency should write its own ticket. If you believe that the taxpayer wants the Federal agencies to write their own tickets as to appropriations and you sit here and blindly acquiesce, then, of course, you will support it. On the other hand, if you feel that your duty is to keep within bounds the expenditure of an agency in line with its needs, then the appropriation that we are suggesting by the amendment will be supported.

Much has been said about the value of this agency and about its foreign work. We have had a parade of generals before us. I hold in my hand an Associated Press special advance. It is dated November 4. It is headlined "America losing prestige among Algiers French."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, may I have 2 additional minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been fixed.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I have 5 minutes which I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say in that connection that the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] was recognized when the gentleman failed to respond.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to the gentleman from Indiana be allotted to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the agreement arrived at, there appears to be some 5 minutes unused. If the gentleman will modify his request, the Chair will put it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask that 2½ minutes of that be allotted to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the time will be divided between the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DITTER. The concession that is presently being made, and I want to acknowledge it gratefully, will in no way take any of the time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], will it?

The CHAIRMAN. Not at all. His time is allotted. The agreement is that two and a half minutes shall go to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] and two and a half minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I express my appreciation to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

This headline is "America losing prestige among Algiers French." There is a subhead headline, "Poor propaganda gets blame for decline."

I will read a line or two:

A year ago the name "American" was a magic one to the French in north Africa. Today, a year after the Allied landings, it is more often a term of reproach than praise. The blunt truth is that the prestige of the United States among a considerable proportion of the French people has taken a nose-dive.

I further quote:

The British are a long way ahead of the United States in the presentation of her role in the war in north Africa. This is particularly noticeable in the newspapers. Reuters, the British news agency, supplies the bulk of the foreign news in the north African newspapers and London date lines dominate the front pages, often appearing on items originating in this war theater.

The British Broadcasting Corporation also is a highly effective British agency for developing good will among the north Africans and a substantial share of the programs broadcast by the American Expeditionary Force radio station for Allied troops in this theater is received through B. B. C.

Why do I give you that? It comes from Algiers. The date line is "Algiers, November 3, A. P." I give you this to refute the repeated statement that has been made here of the efficiency and the value of O. W. I. It confirms the position which we have taken on the minority side that O. W. I. needs a house cleaning. The best way to force that house cleaning is to hold on to the purse strings here in the House rather than permit the agency itself to write its own ticket.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is recognized for 7½ minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry that my Republican friends have seen fit to make an issue of this particular appropriation, particularly when we have in mind the letter of Lt. Gen. Jacob L. Devers of August 21, 1943, in which he said:

The work you are doing is of enormous importance both in connection with America's relationship with our allies and in connection with military operations.

Also having in mind the letter of November 22, 1942, signed by General Marshall, in which he said:

The efficiency with which the personnel of the Office of War Information cooperated with the War Department in connection with the

operation in north Africa contributed directly toward its success and is deeply appreciated.

Also in view of the evidence found on page 1265 of the hearings where it was stated:

The demands from the other theater for more personnel continue constantly. We now have an order for 83 additional people and we know that at least 100 more will be required.

Then I call attention to this testimony:

It must be remembered that every individual we send is sent at the request of General Eisenhower and General McClure. Every one of them has the approval of the State Department and the War Department.

In other words, no representative or employee of O. W. I. in any foreign theater of war can go into that theater unless the commander of that theater approves the sending of him in there and recommends it.

The amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and there is no one for whom I have a finer regard personally or legislatively, ignores the importance of propaganda in a modern global war. It is not so many months ago since we were on the receiving end, when our people were getting the jittery effects of the propaganda of Nazi Germany and vicious Japan. As a result of the heroism of our men of the air, sea, and land, and the war propaganda now being engaged in, our enemies now are on the receiving end. If the amendment of my friend from New York prevails, it will seriously interfere with the work that is being done along such lines. Let us not take a chance to adversely affect this activity which is part of modern warfare by failing to make this appropriation for the work. Just because some may not like some individual here and there is no justification for voting against an activity which General Devers has said is "of enormous importance."

Let us remember that this \$5,000,000 is simply appropriating the balance of a \$10,000,000 appropriation recommended last year for the 1944 fiscal year. When the appropriation was made for the 1944 fiscal year in this activity the recommendation was \$10,000,000. The Committee on Appropriations cut it to \$5,000,000 because it was impossible to determine then how expanded the war activities would be in the future. It was suggested that they come back if they needed a deficiency appropriation. We must bear in mind that last spring the rapid progress of our armies in the Mediterranean could not be foreseen, nor the preparation for extensive military operations in other theaters. Therefore, this is simply asking for the \$5,000,000 the Committee on Appropriations in its wisdom cut out last year of the \$10,000,000 that was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

Insofar as this work in support of military operations is concerned, whether we like some individual or some policy or not, we must realize that in all fields of war the O. W. I. operates under the orders of the theater commanders.

Some criticism has been directed against this agency because of the number of the press releases it has issued.



We must be fair and bear in mind that the O. W. I. issues press releases for 22 other war agencies. The large part of the press releases issued by the O. W. I. are required by law to be issued through that agency. Under a statutory duty, the O. W. I. gives public notice of administrative decisions and orders of such agencies as the O. P. A., the W. P. B., the O. D. T., and others. In a week of releases made recently, 65 percent were reports of administrative actions by various agencies. During September, for example, a total of 1,140 releases were issued, of which only 19 percent, or 222, related to the work of the O. W. I. I have here a break down which I shall put in the RECORD:

Break-down by agencies:	Number of releases
Office of Price Administration.....	322
Office of War Information.....	222
War Production Board.....	189
Department of Agriculture.....	54
War Manpower Commission.....	30
Office of Defense Transportation.....	29
Petroleum Administrator for War.....	20
Solid Fuels Administration for War.....	16
Maritime Commission.....	12
Department of the Interior.....	10
Office of Civilian Defense.....	8
War Shipping Administration.....	7
Coal Mines Administration.....	7
Department of Labor.....	7
Federal Security Agency.....	5
Fair Employment Practices Committee.....	5
Office of Economic Stabilization.....	3
Lend-Lease Administration.....	2
Office of Foreign Economic Cooperation.....	2
Smaller War Plants Corporation.....	2
War Relocation Authority.....	1
Federal Works Agency.....	1
Department of Justice.....	1
Total.....	1,140

In modern war, with the effective means of communication that exist, we cannot underestimate the value of work of this kind against the enemy. It is through these means that we help undermine the morale of the enemy and combat the propaganda efforts of the enemy in neutral countries, to do effective work among the people of every conquered country by informing them of what is happening, of the successes of our armed forces, and of our productive capacity, and to encourage them.

Constructive criticism is and should be always in order, and always is welcomed. I never have any opposition to and I never condemn constructive criticism. I respect the views of all with whom I disagree. However, whenever any activity such as this is a part of our strategy in the waging of a global war, I do not think it is a wise or a proper course to follow to prevent the operation of the whole activity because of dislike of some appointee or some policy. The course to take, it seems to me, is to make specific criticism of a constructive nature with a view to correction.

Having in mind the importance of this work as a war activity, and recognizing that some persons may not like some appointee or some policy, but looking at its basic importance with reference to global war, I hope that the amendment

offered by the gentleman from New York will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I deem it scarcely necessary that one should have to appeal to the patriotism of the Members of this House. One hundred and sixty-eight Members of this House wore the uniform in the last war. One hundred and twenty-three Members of this House presently have sons and daughters in the military service. This speaks for itself, and there is no one here who would knowingly do anything to impair the efficacy of psychological warfare conducted through the O. W. I. Speech after speech has been directed to that point and it is not in issue. Everybody is agreed that O. W. I. should carry on. The only question is here, How much money do they need to carry on? That is a grave responsibility for the Congress.

Yesterday morning the Budget Bureau told me that there are \$60,000,000.00 of unobligated war balances. Yesterday morning the Budget Bureau told me there were \$148,000,000.00 of war expenditures that had not yet been liquidated or expended. There is a rising tide of spending consciousness in the country. There is a responsibility on this Congress to measure every dollar to give the people of the country who are bearing their part of this burden a break. So the only issue here is, Do they have money enough?

Congress gave them over-all \$33,000,000 plus early this year, namely \$24,000,000 for overseas warfare plus \$5,000,000 in the contingent fund. With the approval of the President, Elmer Davis can use that contingent fund for psychological warfare. So he could have \$29,000,000 for overseas operations in enemy and enemy-occupied areas.

How much have they expended out of this fund in the first quarter? Six million two hundred thousand dollars. They still have a very substantial amount of money. On the basis of expenditures for the first quarter, they will wind up at the end of the year with more than \$4,000,000 in unobligated balances. That is one of the best recommendations I know of for the Taber amendment to reduce the pending request from five million to one million.

When they say that General Marshall, General McClure, and General Devers speak in behalf of this, read the testimony carefully. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] said, in effect, as indicated in the hearings, "General McClure, have you anything to say about O. W. I.?" He said, "They did a good job at the front." General Marshall said they did a good job at the front in Africa. But, let me remind you, they have \$13,200,000 for expenditure, not at the front but in Allied and in neutral countries. This is not my figure, if you please; you will find it all in the record, and it will not be controverted. All of that money is available for psychological warfare in conjunction with an actual or projected military operation.

So the question before us today is, Does O. W. I. have funds sufficient to do a good, efficacious job of psychological warfare? The answer is, very simply and plainly, on the basis of the figures they have submitted to the committee, that they have. There are ample funds. In addition, what they have in the contingent fund of \$5,000,000, which presently, I think, is down to about \$4,200,000, is still available for this same purpose with the approval of the President. Why not use these funds, instead of appearing before Congress for additional funds?

As I envision the problem before us, it looks as if they are trying to set up sufficient funds to have a very substantial unobligated balance at the end of the year. What with \$60,000,000.00 of unobligated money now, it is high time that the Congress give this a most careful scrutiny. This amendment is quite in line. I cannot too strongly emphasize, in view of many of the emotional arguments made on this matter, that the issue is not whether O. W. I. shall continue its program of psychological warfare but whether they have sufficient funds available for that purpose at the present time.

It is rather singular that long ago Ralph Waldo Emerson wrote, "Of all debts, man is least willing to pay taxes. What a satire on government." And why? Because as a general thing people see waste, they see extravagance, they see indefensible expenditure, and then there comes a kind of quiet but determined rebellion in the hearts and the minds of the taxpayers.

The people can speak only through us as their elected representatives in securing the most careful scrutiny of all expenditures that taxes might be kept within bounds. It is therefore for us to measure the O. W. I. request before us now, not for the purpose of crippling or destroying this agency or its operations in the field of psychological warfare but to provide the funds that are needed, but no more. That leaves the responsibility upon us that there shall be no reproach upon the efficiency of government. So the only issue here is not whether psychological warfare will continue, because it will. It is only a question of whether the O. W. I. has sufficient funds, and the only answer to that is the great, big, resounding, affirmative "Yes." I suggest that on the record presented by the deficiency committee the Taber amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time assigned to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] be transferred to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, just before we vote on this very important amendment, I would like,



if I may, to get the record straight on the historical development of this item we are now considering. In the first place, let us please remember that the Domestic Branch of the O. W. I. is not in any way involved in this amendment. It was involved in the regular appropriation bill earlier this session, and the House of Representatives, in its wisdom, reduced the Budget estimate from \$8,500,000 to \$2,750,000. There are no funds whatsoever in this bill for the Domestic Branch of the O. W. I., but it might be recalled that the Domestic Branch of the O. W. I. has been streamlined by Congress, and it might be interesting to some gentlemen to know, perhaps, and comforting to some, that it is now under the management and control of a very distinguished journalist, Mr. Palmer Hoyt, former editor of the Portland Oregonian, and, so far as I know, there has been no criticism, certainly from my friends on the left-hand side of the House, of the operation of the O. W. I. Domestic Branch under Mr. Palmer Hoyt.

Mr. Chairman, we get wrong sometimes, we all do, in our zeal. I have said before, and I repeat, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is more nearly always right than wrong, but he has the peculiar faculty, when he gets wrong, of getting wrong all the way. He gets wrong good and strong. He is by himself on this appropriation. He is in the position now of standing alone. Oh, yes, some gentlemen are going to support his amendment, but I have not heard a single gentleman get up on the floor today and say that the O. W. I. overseas service is a stench and that it ought to be wiped out.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. TABER. I said that it is a stench, but I did not say that it ought to be wiped out.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I understood the gentleman to say that he had to compromise with his conscience in order to give them a million dollars. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES] asked, if it is that bad, why give them a million dollars, and it was then that my friend said, if I recollect right, that that is too much, and that he had to compromise with his conscience to even give them that. But along comes my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. He said, of course, we are for this thing, but they don't need any more money, they can get it somewhere else. Last year the Appropriations Committee said to them when they asked for \$10,000,000 for this contingency fund for use in conjunction with actual or projected military operations; for this highly specialized, some of it secret, work, under the Office of War Information, what did we say? Just what the gentleman said in the well of the House today, that we are going to be here, that we are going to be in session, and that we will give them \$5,000,000 now, and that they can come back. So we cut it half in two, and the Congress approved that action, and we gave them earlier this year only \$5,000,000 instead of the \$10,000,000 they said they needed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What the gentleman refers to, of course, is that the request was for a contingency.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; the work that this \$5,000,000 in the bill is for. We only gave them half of what they asked for in the last bill, and now they come back and say they are going to have to get ten million more, and they ask for \$5,000,000 now, and indicate they may need to come back for \$5,000,000 more. Mr. Chairman, it is a strange thing to me, engaged as we are in a global war, approaching, as we are, the zero hour, spending, as we are, billions of dollars in this effort to win the war, that we will stop and haggle about such a relatively small sum of money as this. Nobody can say that this Committee on Appropriations did not do a little cutting in this bill.

About eighty-some percent of the Budget estimates were eliminated. One gentleman has asked, "Is there any significance in the fact that you did not cut this item any?" No; there is not, because there are a great many items that we did not touch at all. We did not touch the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics for necessary scientific research, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Weather Bureau, the Coast Survey, and other activities related to the war. But, this House of Representatives, this day, and many gentlemen whom I am addressing today, have established a very enviable record of giving support to the armed forces in what they said they need to fight this war. We may change that today. We may set a precedent today, but so far we have not said to the Joint Chiefs of Staff and to the accredited military leaders of this country, "You say you need so many airplanes, but we do not think so. You say you need so many tanks, but we do not think so. You say you need this activity, but we think you ought to get along with a certain amount."

Today we may establish the fact that we are going to say to them that "notwithstanding the fact that you say you need the full force and effect of the O. W. I. on the battle front, we are going to cut it out," because if you vote for this amendment you would cut it out.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Where, if anywhere, did any military man say that we needed \$5,000,000 appropriated at this time?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. They did not say they needed \$5,000,000, but they said they needed the help of the Overseas Branch, and if you cut out this appropriation, they will not have that help.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes, in just a minute. Now, I know about the \$29,000,000. We gave them this year \$24,000,000 for the Overseas Branch and an additional \$5,000,000 in this kind of a contingency item for use in connection with actual or projected mili-

tary operations when the President released that money to them. They could not use it until he released it for the military reason. They have \$24,000,000 for their general work. The gentleman said in the first 3 months they had obligated \$6,000,000. Now, it has been 4 months and they have obligated \$8,380,000 of the \$24,000,000. The entire \$24,000,000 has been allocated as follows:

Work directed to and against enemy and enemy-occupied countries, \$10,800,000;

Work in and to neutral countries, \$4,900,000;

Work in and to Allied areas, \$8,300,000.

Every penny of the money that we gave them in this \$24,000,000 has been allocated and much of it is being used in the foreign broadcasts from New York and San Francisco. If you take \$5,000,000 away from the \$16,000,000 that is now left, you cripple the activity in the foreign field; it would leave only \$11,000,000 for all other O. W. I. overseas operations for the rest of the year.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania read an Associated Press article a few moments ago in which America was criticized for not having enough propaganda; that the British were ahead of us. That may be true. What we have appropriated and made available for this service is infinitesimal as compared with what the enemy countries have used and what Great Britain has used. If we divert these funds we place our propaganda definitely where my friend alleges it is, in north Africa.

Reduce our facilities and service and we leave to our British, Russian, and Chinese allies the task of interpreting America, disseminating news and providing the information to insure the friendly reception of American troops wherever garrisoned. It is doubtful that the British, the Russians, or the Chinese can speak for America as well as Americans can speak for themselves. Our allies should not be solely responsible for providing the information that will interpret America abroad and the actual news of what American forces are contributing to the winning of the war on the land and the sea and in the air all over the world.

Mr. TABER. And the British have less in north Africa and Italy than we, and still they are doing well and we are not.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. We will not help them any by taking away what they already have. The \$5,000,000 asked for in this bill provides 2,024 personnel altogether, 1,716 of which are to be in the military program work overseas.

Now let us see about this. We do not have to go out and speculate as to what this means. We had a gentleman here in the House today, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. Judd, who gave us personal testimony as to what it means. I am sorry there was not a full membership of the House to hear that statement, because the several times this distinguished gentleman has addressed this body he has



impressed us because of his knowledge, his sincerity, and his ability. He told you he lived in the Orient. He told you what propaganda means. Every man knows today that propaganda and strategic warfare is as much an integral part of an invading, marching army as shot and shell and airplanes. Yet we haggle today, seeking to cripple this activity when we are told that it is necessary and important.

I want to read something to you for just a minute. My dear friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] got up today and he made a little light of something that somebody said yesterday that this might save lives. Let us see about that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, I hope the gentleman will not put words into my mouth.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; but I think the gentleman made this statement, that somebody had exaggerated the fact by suggesting that this appropriation might actually save lives.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It was only a case of interpreting exactly the language of the military men.

Mr. FORD. He said we were hysterical.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, I am afraid I addressed that to something besides that testimony.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Now, let us see just a minute. Are we going to take the testimony of the gentleman from New York, "Admiral" TABER, and the gentleman from Virginia, "General" WOODRUM, or are we going to take the testimony of somebody who actually knows? It just so happens that Brig. Gen. Robert A. McClure was in Washington when this matter came before the committee. He was sent to the United States by General Eisenhower for a conference on censorship matters. Our committee heard he was in Washington and secured permission of the War Department to have him appear before our committee. He is a Regular Army man—a professional soldier. He was formerly military attaché in London. He is on the staff of General Eisenhower, commander of the Allied forces in the Mediterranean theater, in charge of psychological warfare, censorship, and public relations. In this capacity General McClure has under his immediate direction all of the psychological warfare and propaganda forces of the Allied armies. He directs forces which constitute an integrated unit, consisting of the United States organization of the Office of War Information, military personnel, and forces of the Office of Strategic Services, and of British forces, consisting of the British Political Warfare and the Ministry of Information, military and naval personnel.

The entire forces operate as a single unit under General McClure subject to the general direction of General Eisenhower. This procedure is typical of procedures in other theaters of the war in connection with military operations. I want to read what he says about O. W. I. operations overseas, and whether it is a stench, whether this Congress should today deny the armed forces the instru-

mentalities they say they need. This is what he says.

I read:

The CHAIRMAN. What have you to say about the effectiveness of O. W. I. activities at the front, General McClure?

General McCURE. I am convinced that they are particularly effective and have made an important contribution to our military effort.

The CHAIRMAN. What criticism have you to make, or what suggestions have you to make, regarding the operations of O. W. I. at the front at the present time?

General McCURE. I have no criticism of them. I am particularly satisfied with their cooperation and the help they are furnishing us.

A little further in the colloquy the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] asked this question:

Mr. SNYDER. Do you think that O. W. I., as it has been operated in north Africa, Sicily, and Italy since its inception, has saved the lives of American boys to any extent? If you did not have O. W. I. would there have been more lives lost, without the steps we have taken thus far?

General McCURE. I can only state my opinion, and I would say definitely "Yes." Illustrative of that is the fact that a number of Axis soldiers, Italians and Germans, have come in and surrendered, and used as their passes through the lines the leaflets we have dropped, calling for their surrender. Using that instance only as an answer to your question, I should say the propaganda we have used there has kept a number of soldiers from shooting at us, and thereby saved the lives of our own troops.

The chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], also asked:

The CHAIRMAN. Did I understand you to say that you did not have sufficient service of this character in your area and that you could use additional personnel and additional O. W. I. service?

General McCURE. That is correct, sir; and we have made requisition on Mr. Davis for that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. In just a few moments.

Mr. Chairman, my good friend from New York, was doing like we lawyers do sometimes when we get in court and pick up an opinion and start to read it to the judge, thinking it is going to support us, and then it turns out it does not help us any. I sympathize with him. He started to read from an article by William L. Shirer, holding him up as a great authority because he had been over there and had seen at first hand what had been done. He was held up as a man who knew what he was talking about. As my good friend read on we saw his embarrassment, for he found he was reading a very strong endorsement from William Shirer of O. W. I. I now read from a recent article by William Shirer. I wish I had time to read all of it, but I shall have time to read only the first paragraph or two:

At long last a little can now be told of how one branch of our propaganda in north Africa and Sicily was successfully carried out. In this war there are two principal weapons of propaganda, radio and leaflets. We have heard a great deal about the radio war. We know very little about "pamphlet

warfare." Yet there is good reason to believe (unfortunately the complete story cannot yet be told, because of military security) that Anglo-American pamphlets spread among the German-Italian troops in Tunisia and Sicily by the millions, contributed not a little to the quick Allied victories in those two campaigns.

Such a statement may well strike many Americans as a silly exaggeration. How can a leaflet, a mere piece of paper, help win battles? The facts made a rather impressive answer. We have, for example, the unsolicited word of a captured Italian general who threw up his hands and said: "I could do nothing to maintain the morale of my men when they were plastered with hundreds of your leaflets every day." What made the leaflets so effective, he admitted, was that his men believed them. We shall see in this article what those pamphlets said.

What else? We find in the hearings evidence that General Eisenhower, General Marshall, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, General Patton, and General McClure have praised the O. W. I. service along this line, and yet here we are today, in considering this bill, taking the attitude that we will deny them sufficient funds to carry out this very important activity.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Is it not logically true that the more the combat of war spreads, the more countries that become involved, the more of this service we shall need?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is what I was trying in a feeble way to get over to the Committee; That we are right at a critical moment in this thing. Other battle fronts are going to be opened up. We have heard much recently of that. We know that when an enemy begins to be softened up, he is particularly susceptible to propaganda. If you pour it in relentlessly it is tremendously effective. If this \$5,000,000 or \$10,000,000, or even a larger sum contributes to a shortening of the war by a single day it saves the lives of the men who would otherwise be killed that day. The effectiveness of propaganda and psychological warfare needs not be proven here. It has been demonstrated time and time again in this war. We want to win this war in the shortest possible time to save the lives of our boys and relieve the suffering and misery of the many distressed populations under the Axis yoke. Propaganda and psychological warfare will help do it and this \$5,000,000 is for that purpose, not in the United States but abroad in connection with actual or projected military operations. Let us do the sane and sensible thing here and not be diverted from the main issue.

I do hope this Committee under the guise of economy will not establish perhaps the first record for some of us in voting against something that directly affects the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired; all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.



The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 129, noes 132.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. TABER and Mr. CANNON of Missouri.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 139, noes 146.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Migration of workers: To enable the War Manpower Commission to provide, in accordance with regulations described by the Chairman of said Commission, for the temporary migration of workers from foreign countries (pursuant to agreements between the United States and such foreign countries) and from Territories and possessions of the United States, for employment in the continental United States with industries and services essential to the war effort, including the transportation of such workers from points outside the United States to ports of entry of the United States and return (including transportation from place of employment in the United States to port of entry of the United States in any case of default by an employer to provide such transportation to a worker, in which event the employer shall be liable to the United States for the cost thereof), reasonable subsistence and emergency medical care en route, and guarantees of employment while in the United States to the extent agreed upon with the foreign country from which the worker is imported, \$2,125,000, of which not to exceed \$125,000 shall be available for all administrative expenses necessary for the foregoing, including not to exceed \$12,250 for temporary employment of administrative personnel outside continental United States, not to exceed \$1,000 for printing and binding outside continental United States without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111), and not to exceed \$26,880 for travel expenses: *Provided*, That no transportation of workers shall be allowed hereunder unless the employer and the worker have entered into a contract for employment approved by said Chairman or his designee, and unless said Chairman certifies that reasonably adequate use is being made of the local labor supply: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall remain available after June 30, 1944, to the extent necessary to provide for the return of the workers to the country from which they migrated under the provisions hereof: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the recruitment or transportation of workers for employment in agriculture.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Page 6, lines 18 and 19, strike out the word "described" and insert in lieu thereof the word "prescribed."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is merely a perfecting amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I am going along with the recommendations of the committee because of the tremendous importance of the war manpower problem. I am going along, although I think the committee has been liberal in its recommendations.

I rise for the purpose of making three observations:

First. Right or wrong, the policies of the War Manpower Commission are leading to almost complete job control by the Federal Government. The Congress and the country should realize this fact. Wherever a controlled referral plan has been adopted, anyone out of a job will probably have to obtain a job through the United States Employment Service. Wherever a controlled referral plan has been adopted, anyone having a war job or a nonwar job and desiring to change that job will probably be able to make the change only if approved by the United States Employment Service. Where no controlled referral plan has been adopted, the power to classify a given area in class 1, which means no further war contracts, is obviously a tremendous lever with which to induce adoption of the plan. It is estimated that the controlled referral plan will be in operation in all critical manpower-shortage areas and in 25 percent of all prospective areas of this character by December 1, 1943.

Second. Despite the fact that there are some 3,300,000 workers on the swollen Federal pay roll at this time, the record indicates that the War Manpower Commission has no figures as to those in non-essential positions who can be transferred to more essential war jobs, and that the Commission itself has made no study of Federal employees in this connection.

Third. My attention was called in August to an advertisement in a Buffalo paper reading, in part, as follows:

Strong, husky men, can you qualify? Earn \$1.15 per hour for unskilled work and a bonus excess. We teach unskilled laborers and in a short time they have qualified for an increase to \$1.50 per hour. Apply to U. S. E. S., 51 Erie Street, immediately.

The War Manpower Commission disclaims responsibility, stating that it acts merely as the mouthpiece for those advertising for workers. To my mind, it is both absurd and unwarranted for one Government agency to lend itself in this manner to the payment of wages at the rate of \$1.50 per hour to unskilled labor, while another branch of the Government, chanting "hold the line," insists on limiting wages to those who have become highly skilled by long years of effort to a very much lower level.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I wish, in the next few minutes, to briefly refer to an activity of the War Manpower Commission as it is affecting many of the industrial communities in this country. Three of the cities within my congressional district have been declared to be in what is called

a labor scarcity area. Under this ruling of the War Manpower Commission, no procurement officer of the Army, Navy, Maritime Commission, or Treasury Department can place orders for materials that can be purchased in any nonlabor scarcity area. The unfortunate part of that ruling is that it is working a definite hardship on the small manufacturers. The larger industries in my district, such as Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Engine Corporation, the Colt Manufacturing Co., and units of the ball-bearing industry are not affected at this time by the labor-scarcity ruling. However, there are several small and medium-sized industries that are seriously and adversely affected.

Ten days ago one such factory laid off 80 people. Yesterday, another factory laid off 200 employees. It is pretty hard to convince those that are being laid off that Hartford, Conn., is actually in a critical labor shortage area.

It is my understanding that this ruling is in force in an effort to force employees, laid off from plants that have no business, to go into the ball-bearing industry where employees are needed. Unfortunately, however, it does not work out just that way. Every bit of information that I can secure indicates that those laid off go back to their home communities, rather than go into the ball-bearing industry. Last week I talked to a procurement officer in the War Department and was startled to have him inform me that in all probability we would have a limited unemployment problem in Hartford within 90 days, rather than being worried about labor scarcity. At this time, when we are being told that the Army and Navy needs material as it has never been needed before, I am at a loss to understand why orders should be denied to manufacturers who have the necessary manpower to not only accept the order but to make delivery on the date set by the War or Navy Department.

I have asked the War Manpower Commission to make a resurvey of the whole labor situation in central Connecticut. I hope that some way can be found to lift the ban that prevents orders from being placed in that area. I appeal to my colleagues from other industrial areas that are adversely affected by the rulings of the War Manpower Commission to join with me in this effort.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION

The amount that may be used for administrative expenses in the fiscal year 1944 under the head "War Shipping Administration, revolving fund," is hereby increased from \$9,650,000 to \$12,000,000.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no legislation authorizing this appropriation, and, further, it changes existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] desire to be heard?



Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the provision is subject to a point of order, and we yield the point.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

Employees' compensation fund: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1944, for the payment of compensation provided by the act of September 7, 1916 (5 U. S. C. 785), as amended, including the objects specified under this head in the Employees' Compensation Commission Appropriation Act, 1944, \$3,000,000, which, together with the amount heretofore appropriated under this head, shall be available also for reimbursement payments authorized by the act of December 2, 1942 (42 U. S. C. 1701), rehabilitation expenses and fees or payments to other agencies of the United States and other public agencies or private persons, agencies, or institutions, for services or facilities rendered by them pursuant to agreement and approved by the Commission.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the paragraph just read be passed over for the present in view of the fact that the amount contained therein is dependent upon a subsequent item appearing on page 28. I merely wish to pass this paragraph over temporarily.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

War Housing: For an additional amount to carry out the purposes of title I of the act of October 14, 1940 (42 U. S. C. ch. 9), as amended, and subject to the applicable provisions of the joint resolution approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1115), \$50,000,000, to remain available during the continuance of the unlimited national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILSON: Page 17, line 8, strike out "\$50,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$25,000,000."

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, having been a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds which authorized this appropriation some time ago, and having traveled with this committee in practically every State of the Union and seeing first hand the way the money is being used which we have appropriated, and from a study of the need for new appropriations, I have seen fit to offer this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations is to be congratulated on their successful efforts to eliminate non-essential spending of the taxpayers' money. However, it is only reasonable to assume that they have not been able to hear both sides of all the issues involved for which appropriations are requested. The item of Federal public housing now under discussion should be completely eliminated and by so doing the committee would have further reduced the amount of this bill from \$225,000,000 to \$150,000,000 and thereby

have real cause for rejoicing over the success of their efforts.

My amendment merely calls for reducing the \$50,000,000 requested in the bill to \$25,000,000. I do not consider the economy of the Government any different from my own personal economy and therefore I guard the funds of my taxpayers as I would guard my own personal funds. When we who believe in the American philosophy of economy need funds for personal use and are hard pressed, we usually conserve. We do not overstaff our businesses or overbuild our farms or overpay for land and property or for personnel to operate our various businesses. Therefore, I cannot subscribe to the argument presented in defense of this appropriation measure in view of the facts I am going to present to this committee.

Originally, our criterion for allocating houses was one house per five applications, assuming that at least 400 of 500 applicants would already be housed and upon shifting would leave their homes available for others, thereby leaving the 100 houses available for the shifting around of personnel plus any new and unhoused applicants. But those in the National Housing Agency desirous of holding their high-salaried jobs have had to find a greater need for housing or give up their jobs, which has resulted in the building of five houses for each application in many cases, or a complete reversal of the original criterion. Also in the beginning the F. P. H. A. was organized only to supplement private building. In other words, take care of any needed housing where private capital was unable to take care of it. We now have a complete reversal of that rule, for it is a well-known fact that private capital today is only being permitted to supplement the Federal public housing. This is very unfair for the taxpaying public businessmen to have to compete with their own money. As evidence that the National Housing Agency has overbuilt, I only need to refer to a few projects in and near Washington and in my home State of Indiana.

First. Let me refer to the Kingsford Heights project in Indiana. Last July, when we gave this Administration \$2,000,000 for housing, I cited the Kingsford Heights project, where 286 houses were available for occupancy and only 242 occupied, and where the F. P. H. A. was continuing to build a total of 2,970. I charged that this was a waste of funds, critical materials, and manpower, and that the project should be discontinued for the sake of saving the taxpayers millions of dollars. The project was completed. A ghost city was built and yet, today, only 319 of those 2,970 houses are occupied, and the F. P. H. A. has seen fit to move them away at an expense of approximately \$1,500 per unit, plus the installation of utilities at some \$600 to \$1,000 per unit, making the relocation of the house cost approximately \$2,500, when the original cost was only around \$2,800, and would be much less today.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I am sure we could build these houses in the new loca-

tion from the ground up for less money than it is going to take to move them and also have better houses. But that is not all, Mr. Chairman; when I was in Indiana this summer I found that they had a staff of 53 people looking after this housing project on a pay roll amounting to \$97,480. The manager of that housing project, where 319 houses were occupied, receives a salary of \$5,600 a year, with 10 managing assistants drawing up to \$3,200 each per year.

There is the Versailles project, which illustrates the waste of money in the purchase of land for these projects. The land on which the Versailles project is located consists of 19.3 acres in the country hills of southern Indiana—suburban to a town of less than 5,000. The assessed valuation was \$970, or \$50.50 per acre. The Government housing authorities paid not \$970 but \$17,500 for it, or \$907 per acre.

Gentlemen, may I ask you, Would you, if you were hard-pressed for funds, pay that price for that land, or can we assume that anyone spending like that is hard-pressed for funds? I am sure you would not, and I am sure you will not, support an appropriation for an agency that has money to spend in that way; also, gentlemen, in regard to the administration of that project, consisting of 100 nice brick homes, I wish to inform you that it is costing us 165 percent of the operating income to operate that project alone.

Let me refer briefly to the Crane Naval Ammunition Depot project, Crane, Ind. Six hundred homes were under construction for a year or more and have been completed for many months, a project which I also fought bitterly and informed Members of this body to stop appropriating money for such purposes because those houses would never be used. Today, gentlemen, after they have lowered the rent, moved electric refrigerators in, and done everything possible to entice people to move in, they have an occupancy of 150.

The Charlestown, Ind., project—750 houses—has been finished many months and only 204 of the houses are occupied. A storm came along one day last summer and flattened—and I mean flattened—some hundred of those houses and materially damaged 150 more.

The Seymour, Ind., project, located adjacent to the Freeman Army Air Field, has 350 units with only 90 occupied by civilian personnel.

The Washington Post, on November 5, carried an item by the Associated Press stating that 950 dormitories for war workers were constructed in Radford-Pulaski. None is occupied.

The Baltimore paper, on October 26, special, stated that 260 bed dorms built for war workers never have been occupied. Only 90 of 500 new trailers have been occupied, only 62 of 299 houses have been occupied with 450 expected to be ready for occupancy soon; 297 homes in another project are vacant.

I ask you, gentlemen, Can you support an appropriation to be used in this matter? But, gentlemen, I have not arrived



at the most dangerous part of the whole program. I want to read to you from a recent publication of the National Real Estate News:

As we told you last week it would, the F. P. H. A. has authorized regional offices to accept applications for post-war public-housing projects. Pressure for that action seems to have come principally from the local housing authorities.

Let me read a paragraph from the National Association of Home Builders of the United States, October 22:

As a preliminary step toward formulating its post-war housing program, the F. P. H. A. has announced that it will start receiving applications for federally aided projects and has sent instructions to this effect to its regional offices.

Gentlemen, if we are going to forestall this national socialistic trend, we had better get busy now. If we are going to permit this Government to own and operate the roofs over our people's heads, we had better call our boys home and give up the fight for there will be nothing left for us to fight for. I ask unanimous support of my amendment to forestall this national socialistic development while it is in the embryo stage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Here is an article from a Baltimore paper of October 26. A large number of 2,100 publicly owned trailers are vacant and only 90 of 500 new trailers have been occupied. A large number of 2,100 already existing trailers are not occupied, yet they have seen fit to move in 500 new trailers, of which only 90 are occupied. Only 62 of 299 new houses in another project are occupied, with 450 additional houses of a 1,000-unit project expected to be ready for occupancy within a week.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In what cities are these projects located?

Mr. WILSON. In Baltimore, Md., and down at Radford-Pulaski, Va. Over in my State about 50 percent of all the projects I know of have many houses standing idle. This includes Crane, Ind., Freeman Airfield, Seymour, Ind., and Charlestown, Ind.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Have the houses to which the gentleman has referred been built under the Lanham Act, and have the trailers been acquired under the Lanham Act?

Mr. WILSON. That is correct.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say that no trailers whatever have been acquired under the Lanham Act.

Mr. WILSON. The Federal Public Housing Authority built the houses. The trailers are part of the National Housing Agency program.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Just the houses, then?

Mr. WILSON. The houses were built from Lanham Act funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I call attention to the situation that exists with reference to war housing insofar as war housing appertains to legislation which emanated from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. We held 5 weeks of hearings before that committee with reference to what amount of authorization might be necessary to construct essential temporary war housing, to be removed when the war is over. After 5 weeks of hearings, we reported legislation authorizing \$300,000,000 for that purpose, although \$400,000,000 had been requested in the message which came from the President.

That was our deliberate judgment after 5 weeks of public hearings. On the floor of the House of Representatives, and I think I may safely say in the committee itself, the gentleman from Indiana contended that \$200,000,000 would be sufficient. Only \$100,000,000 has thus far been appropriated, and consequently with the \$50,000,000 appropriated in this measure, we would still be \$50,000,000 short of what the gentleman from Indiana thought, after all these hearings, was the proper amount to be authorized and appropriated for this purpose.

This appropriation is distinctly and peculiarly for war housing. It is for temporary construction. It is for in-migrant workers at these various plants, and no in-migrant worker today can be taken to one of those plants unless there is a house awaiting him. This goes to our matter of production. These houses are built upon the recommendation of the Army and the Navy to meet their needs. Not one penny of this money is to be used or can be used under this legislation for any post-war housing. It is for the actual construction of temporary units which, under the terms of the legislation itself, are to be removed when this war is over.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. No. Reference has been made to post-war housing. This has nothing whatever to do with that.

Mr. WILSON. It goes to pay the salaries of these men who are out in the field.

Mr. LANHAM. I decline to yield. The gentleman has a habit of being in an objecting mood, and monopolizing the meetings of the committee, and I should like to have such time as I have available for me here.

The gentleman makes reference, for instance, to Radford, Va. It is easy to cite a case of that sort. What is the situation at Radford? It is construction out in the country at a powder plant, very temporary construction, and when a sufficient quantity of powder has been manufactured to meet present needs, of course, those houses are no longer oc-

cupied until it shall be necessary for us to produce more powder there. With reference to vacancies, 94 percent of the family units built under this legislation are occupied. With reference to single workers the percentage naturally is not that high, because many of these have been called into the service and, consequently, there are fluctuations in occupancy. A number of these plants were for ordnance, and the housing was constructed upon the recommendation of the Army and the Navy Departments, and then when the ordnance had reached a certain level that the naval and the military authorities thought was sufficient for the present, they discontinued or reduced production at that particular plant, and naturally that has led to some temporary vacancies until it shall be necessary to produce again that kind of ordnance.

The administrative authorities of the National Housing Agency, insofar as this act is concerned, have been very helpful and very cooperative. They themselves suggested, in order to iron out any kinks and to discuss any complaints which might be made, that we have a monthly meeting of our committee with the administrative officers; and we have carried that out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, there are gentlemen present who can testify that we have succeeded in getting many of their problems and many of their difficulties settled through those conferences we have had with the administrative officers at these meetings and at other meetings which have been especially called to look after their problems.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Do I understand that all of this housing will be removed after the war?

Mr. LANHAM. Every bit of it for which this bill provides.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I want to say to the gentleman that as far as the Hartford area is concerned, we would have been in a bad way if we had not been able to get this housing.

Mr. LANHAM. I appreciate what the gentleman has said, and the testimony that was brought before the Committee on Appropriations shows, in my judgment, as a matter of fact, proper basis for the appropriation of the entire authorization. That committee has cut it to the minimum. I hope that when the matter goes to the other body they will have a little more time to examine this particular phase of this measure, because I can realize, as you do, that a great deal of the consideration of the House committee has been with reference to the O. W. I. and some other phases of the pending measure.



Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Is the gentleman prepared to clarify the charges about these housing conditions in Indiana, charged by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON]?

Mr. LANHAM. I certainly am. Some of them arose before the present administrative authorities took office. I have a great deal of data, of course, that I could place in the RECORD, and a great many statements that I could make to clarify this if time permitted.

This appropriation is for plants in many, many sections of the country to carry on the war effort, and the houses are to be removed to get out of the way of private industry when the war is over.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] has again expired.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the majority on the committee would not attempt to get an agreement to close debate on this. We ought to be closing it up pretty soon. What does the gentleman say about 10 minutes?

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. WRIGHT. Reserving the right to object, I would like about 3 minutes.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I modify the request and I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes following the present speaker.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in sympathy with the efforts of our distinguished Appropriations Committee to cut to the bone every civilian expenditure of our Government, and I think my record in support of that sort of a program speaks for itself. I think that with high taxes it is the duty of this Congress to cut out every useless expenditure that we can. But we are in the midst of a war, and I think we would make a great mistake to eliminate an expenditure which is vitally necessary to the prosecution of this war. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, of which I am a member, heard testimony for many days on this issue, and we did all the cutting that we thought we could safely do without jeopardizing our war effort.

I think if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] should unfortunately be agreed to, we might pay for it in the lives of those splendid young men who are fighting the battles over there in Europe. This is a war of production. This is a war of mechanization. Just take the instance the gentleman complained of in his own

district. I received a copy of the newspaper describing that terrible condition with all those houses vacant. Immediately I was concerned, as any of you would have been, and I made inquiry. I found that by reason of the fortunes of war, the production of that great plant was suddenly curtailed. They could not have gone ahead with the production if the houses had not been there. That same thing might happen again. I would rather lose a hundred houses in some locality than to lose this war. We had better spend an extra \$25,000,000 or \$30,000,000 to provide roofs over men's heads rather than to lose this war. Let us not be penny wise and pound foolish. There is a place to cut and a place to spend. I am in favor of so many cuts that have been made in this bill that I want to give all honor to the members of this committee for cutting out unnecessary expenses. But, for God's sake, let us not cut where it is going to lose this war for us. Let us not go back home and have our constituents say, "How foolish you were in cutting out roofs over the men who were to furnish munitions of war where they are needed."

This is a war of constant changes. We are in the midst of a maelstrom, a hurricane, a whirlpool. We must be prepared to take whatever course it is necessary to take. In the days of old when men stood in front of each other with rapiers, fencing and fighting, they had to be prepared for whatever thrust the enemy might take. With keen eye and quick step they had to look in all directions and be prepared for whatever happened.

That is our situation in this terrible conflict. If we shut our eyes and lie down and say: "Well, we are not going to provide the housing," we would not be in position when a plant started here or a plant expanded there to put roofs over the heads of the workers so they could move into the neighborhood and do the necessary work and we shall find ourselves open to the keen thrust of the rapier against which we cannot defend ourselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, in view of the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana, I believe the RECORD should show some of the accomplishments of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds upon which I had the pleasure of serving for 2 years under its splendid chairman the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

One thing I noticed about this committee that I thought was very commendable was the spirit of cooperation that prevailed between Democrats and Republicans, and I think therefore credit for its accomplishments must also be given to such men as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOLMES], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BISHOP], and others.

This committee is in closer communication with and supervision of the admin-

istrative agencies than almost any other committee in the House; it meets monthly with them. Some mistakes have been made in the housing program, particularly in the first year, but, like the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER], who commended the housing program in Connecticut, I know that in Pittsburgh the tremendous steel production would not have been possible without public housing. There was a desire on the part of some at first to make this war housing a continuation of the low-cost housing program. The committee under the leadership of the gentleman from Texas wisely decided that this was war housing and should be kept distinct from low-cost housing and its essential purpose thus preserved.

This committee has in addition tried to cooperate with local municipalities in order that public housing might pay a just share of the tax burden of the community, and has changed the provisions of the act so that now public housing must pay taxes to the same extent as privately owned real estate. This committee has written into law a provision that public housing, wherever possible, must receive from its tenants an economic rent, so that it should not be in competition with other real estate in the community. I have not studied the need for this particular appropriation but I am convinced that if the gentleman from Texas and his fine associates on this committee have examined it and approved it then it is for the best interest of the Nation that it should be allowed. I feel confident that it will be allowed, that that is the sentiment of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to obtain some additional information. I should like to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] if he can give me any direct information along this line: Out in Michigan through the machinery of the office of the Governor there has been created a post-war planning committee. This committee has two divisions; one having to do with post-war housing and another with the liquidation of post-war inventories. This week I am informed by the chairman of the post-war housing phase that in the program in my home city in addition to a 250-unit dwelling project now being completed under the Lanham Act an additional one is being planned, and that over and above those two propositions a group of Austrian, German, and Russian refugees have had their representative in my home city of Saginaw soliciting loans from one of the building and loan associations to build a considerable number of houses for war and post-war occupancy. I understand from the chairman of this committee that these people have brought in an enormous amount of foreign exchange which has been converted into dollars, and that they are now proceeding throughout the United States, going to those cities where



building priorities have not yet been allocated but which are on the barrel head subject to being allocated and picking up that opportunity and proceeding to finance housing against private ownership and public housing operations. I wonder if the gentleman from Texas can give me any information on that?

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that nothing of the kind could be done under this act. This is all temporary housing for the duration. The law itself provides for its removal after the war is over and there is no post-war plan connected with this measure.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am sorry I did not make my question clear. I was not claiming that such operations by the Russian, Austrian, and German refugees could be carried on under the Lanham Act.

I am asking the gentleman as the head of this great operation, for which we have appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars, if he knows anything about this matter of which I speak, and this comes right straight from headquarters.

Mr. LANHAM. I certainly do not know anything about that operation, but I can assure the gentleman it is not being done under this act or with funds under this act unless the provisions of the act are being violated and no one has brought that to the attention of the committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am not claiming it is being done under the Lanham Act. I am trying to find out if you, as the head of this great committee, know anything about these operations I am referring to because they are of interest to my community and I know they are of interest to every city in the State of Michigan.

Mr. LANHAM. I do not know anything about that because they have not come within the provisions of this act.

Mr. WILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON. When this bill was brought into existence first it was meant to supplement the private builders.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Exactly.

Mr. WILSON. But it has turned into a project whereby the private builders supplement the Federal public builders, and they are competitors, nothing else. When the public housers get through the private builders are permitted to come in.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In addition to what you just said, refugees from Austria, Germany, and Russia are now coming in there, obtaining special privileges, and they will finance these projects in a manner that they will get their money out of them as soon as the building is completed and the local community will have to take the rap.

Mr. LANHAM. They are not occupying any of these houses.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I understand that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILSON. Will the gentleman yield for me to read about five lines?

Mr. NORRELL. Not in my time. I am sorry.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that 5 minutes is reserved for the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. No such reservation was made.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I was temporarily absent. I trust that the committee will have 3 minutes anyway.

Mr. NORRELL. This is not coming out of my time, I hope.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, they have the majority of speakers on that side and, unless you give me 5 minutes to answer these false charges which have been made against my speech, I shall object.

The CHAIRMAN. The request was that debate be limited to 15 minutes. Three gentlemen were standing—the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] for the last 5 minutes.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I expect to vote to sustain the recommendations of the committee, but I do want the record kept straight.

Mr. Chairman, the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget to be incorporated in the appropriation bill presently being considered is \$1,196,428,749.32. After several weeks of hearings, your committee has presented this bill for the total sum of \$215,368,444.32, a reduction of \$981,060,305, a reduction of approximately 82 percent.

There are further cuts which, in my judgment, can be made without impairing any of the activities provided for in this bill, and at this time I desire to discuss briefly the pending amendment reducing the sum of \$50,000,000 as provided by the bill supplementing the annual appropriation for the National Housing Agency.

On May 13, 1943, the President sent a message to Congress recommending \$400,000,000 additional authorization for the National Housing Agency, to provide additional housing units for war workers. Soon afterward, Congress passed a bill authorizing \$300,000,000 for such purposes. On July 12, 1943, about 4 months ago, we passed an appropriation bill for \$100,000,000 for the National Housing Agency, and they are now back before us trying to secure the full balance of the authorization. They have heretofore secured a total appropriation of \$1,300,000,000 for construction of publicly financed housing for war workers. If and when this additional \$200,000,000 is made available the total appropriation for publicly financed housing for war workers will amount to one and one-half billion dollars. This is a colossal sum of

money, so large it is difficult to comprehend or analyze. It means that the United States is spending more money for housing than many of our heroic allies are spending in their total war effort—and I think they are exerting possibly their maximum financial ability to win the war. It is nearly as much as Australia has spent so far this year, according to available information, in her total war effort. It is about one-half of the total sum so far expended by Canada this year; about one-third of the total amount expended by France in the fateful year of 1940. It is approximately 32 times the amount expended by Greece in 1941; about 10 times the money expended by Poland in her great effort in 1939, and about one-eighth of the money expended by Russia in her war effort for the year 1941.

I am saying nothing detrimental of these nations, having already said that they are exerting their maximum financial effort. I am trying to say that, in my judgment, this Nation is spending too much for such housing facilities.

Since we started our public-housing program for war workers, there have been constructed by the Government of the United States, with public funds, 122,137 single-person units, and 45,787 are presently programed and are to be completed; 323,722 family units have been constructed, and 233,457 are presently programed and to be constructed; and there are 27,407 stopgap accommodations now available, and 12,509 are programed and are to be completed. This makes a total of 765,019 housing units for war workers constructed with public money.

In addition to this construction, I am advised that 2,768,702 housing units have been constructed with private funds, making a grand total of 3,533,721 housing units for the exclusive use of our war workers.

You will find, upon inquiry, vacant publicly financed houses in practically every defense area in the United States where there is a public-housing project. At one place there are 2,974 family units and 90 percent of the Houses are vacant; at another place there are 3,574 family houses constructed and 1,090 are vacant; 1,606 family units are presently under construction at this project, notwithstanding these enormous vacancies; also, at this place, they have 1,000 dormitory units, all vacant; at another place they have 700 family units and 600 dormitory units constructed, 682 of the family units are vacant out of the 700, and I am advised that all of the dormitory units are vacant. Still at another place there are 2,350 family units and 1,638 dormitory units, and 408 of the family units are vacant and 1,520 are not completed. The others are occupied. Of the dormitories, 1,373 of the units are vacant.

I wish to make it plain that I believe the units are needed at all of these places and that they have not overconstructed so far as the number of units are concerned. The estimates made by the War Department, Manpower Commission,



and other bureaus are probably about correct, but the mistake which has been made has been in spending so much money in the construction of housing facilities. The Washington social planners and advocates of racial equality are desirous, apparently, of spending about as much money as is possible in the construction of these houses. They have cost from about \$3,000 to \$4,500 each. In the South, they have insisted on constructing houses for our Negro workers costing as much as the houses for our white workers. The Negroes are unwilling to pay the necessary rent for such quality houses and consequently most of them are vacant. Too much money has been placed in those units. The local people knew this mistake was being made but these social reformers had to have their way and since they had the money they exercised their authority. The houses are vacant today not because they have overconstructed but because, in view of the investment in each unit, the rents have been more than the workers are willing to pay. I am told that there are war workers in Arkansas who travel in excess of 50 miles per day in going to and from their work because they are unwilling to pay the rent required by the Housing Agency. If these rents were reduced these workers would live at the projects. In many instances the rents are increased because they have improperly and unwisely installed the wrong kind of utilities. For instance, at Portland, Oreg., I am told they have one of the largest housing projects in the Nation, constructed under the shadows of Grand Coulee, Bonneville, and Boulder Dams, presently producing more power than any other area in the world and they found that in view of the shortage of power the houses had to be constructed to be heated by coal, and coal is also used for cooking. I think this is a reflection on that area to say that in the greatest power-producing area in the world, Grand Coulee itself being the largest power dam ever to be constructed, there is insufficient power to be used for fuel in these houses.

The time has come when Congress must refuse to appropriate the funds, if economy is maintained. If the money is appropriated, we know it will be spent. Let us practice rigid economy in every possible way without impairing the war effort and the legitimate activities of our Government in nonwar activities, so that additional tax legislation shall not have to be passed by the Congress. The people want this, they are demanding it, and in my judgment there are several very conspicuous signs we may observe in the recent current events which indicate this is the way they are thinking. I expect to stand by the committee, but I think this is my last vote for funds for this agency, unless a real need is shown.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, the Congress has authorized \$1,500,000,000

for public housing during the war emergency.

Out of this amount the sum of \$1,300,000,000 has been appropriated.

Prior to the recess, \$100,000,000 was appropriated for public housing, and the National Housing Authority has asked the Congress to approve the \$200,000,000 balance of the authorization heretofore enacted.

The Committee on Appropriations has studied this matter thoroughly and has recommended that out of the \$200,000,000 requested that \$50,000,000 be made available by the Congress.

I am of the firm opinion that the National Housing Agency has overbuilt in every section of the country. While I realize that it is difficult to determine the number of workers that will be needed in any particular area during extended periods, the programing on the part of the N. H. A. has squandered millions of the taxpayers' dollars.

In the Kingsford Heights, Ind., project there were constructed in public housing units, 2,970 family dwelling units, of which only 218 were occupied for many months. Even today this project shows a vacancy of 90 percent.

In Point Pleasant, W. Va., there is a vacancy of 682 housing units and only 18 in the project occupied.

In Ravenna, Ohio, there are 422 occupied public-housing units, and 408 vacant, while dormitory facilities, none are occupied and 1,373 are vacant.

In Chateau Pryor, Okla., there are 300 occupied units against 200 vacant ones.

At Radford, Va., there are 361 occupied units and 82 vacant, and none of the 930 dormitory facilities are occupied.

In the Philadelphia area the evidence given to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds showed a vacancy of 60 percent.

This condition exists also in the State of Arkansas, where at Jones Mills 383 family units were constructed and for many weeks only 60 were occupied.

I am told that at Bauxite, Ark., out of 2,762 family units which were constructed, 1,962 were vacant and only 800 occupied.

In the Washington area, I hold in my hand a photograph which shows a portion of the George Pickett Homes, Arlington, Va., which was taken November 1, 1943. While I do not have the exact number of housing units in the project, there exists a vacancy of from 85 to 90 percent, although the project has been completed for 2 months.

The record shows in the testimony before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds that in instance after instance private enterprise was ready and willing and able to build in many sections of the country, but was prevented because of the appropriations by this Congress of a stupendous sum of money to the National Housing Agency.

In the testimony of Robert Gerholz, chairman of the emergency committee of the National Association of Home Builders, it was revealed that in Pittsburg, Calif., 526 public war-housing units were constructed since March 1, 1942, which could have been built by private interests;

At Millbrae, Calif., 800 public war-housing units were built since March 1, 1942, which private builders could have built;

At Hunters Point, Calif., 4,000 public housing units have been built since March 1, 1942, which private industry could have built;

In Richmond, Calif., 19,000 public war-housing units have been authorized since March 1942, and it is estimated that private builders could have built from 7,500 to 10,000 of them.

These projects are only in one State. Mr. Gerholz further stated that in Miami, Fla., 200 public war-housing units could have been built by private builders, and in Wichita, Kans., 5,000 public war-housing units had been built which left no materials and labor for private builders whatever.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious threats to our efforts as a free people is for the Government, through its agencies, to compete with the taxpayers who are attempting to make a livelihood from their chosen fields of endeavor. I refer specifically to the fact that no private builder can obtain priorities to construct housing units during wartime without the approval of the National Housing Agency, which is in full and complete control of all the war public-housing program. It is time for this Congress to clamp down the lid on expenditures of public funds for the purpose of competing with private enterprise.

I am proud to have voted against the authorization of \$300,000,000 for public housing, which was recently passed by the Congress. I felt then, and I do now, that entirely too much money had been spent by the Government for housing of war workers, a goodly portion of which could have been provided by private capital.

The Appropriations Committee has done a commendable job in reducing the request by \$150,000,000. I hope that the conferees on the part of the House will insist that this figure of \$50,000,000, which is entirely adequate, and in my judgment excessive, not be increased by the Senate.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point two letters on the subject with an accompanying statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair reminds the gentleman that such permission will have to be received in the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to realize the extent of the huge shifts in population occasioned by the establishment of the war industries. Overnight vast plants were erected, often in remote locations, and accommodations for housing the workmen who were to operate the plants were hardly an afterthought. But, Mr. Chairman, obviously labor could not be brought in to produce munitions without providing shelter for them and their families. Private capital and private industry could not be depended on to provide this emergency housing. Unless the Government itself made provision for them, adequate labor could not be secured. Housing was as necessary as machinery and raw material.



It follows that appropriations for this purpose are as essential to the war program as the appropriations for the factories. The danger here is not that we have provided too much, but that we have provided too little. In the estimation of those most competent to judge, the entire \$200,000,000 requested by the budget estimate is insufficient. In confirmation of this view I submit a letter from Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board as follows:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,  
Washington, D. C., November 2, 1943.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CANNON: I should like to take this occasion to reiterate the interest of the War Production Board, previously expressed by me to Congressman LANHAM on May 17, 1943, in the program of the National Housing Agency.

I understand that there is now before your committee a request to appropriate \$200,000,000 which constitutes the balance of the authorization of \$300,000,000 for emergency housing made in the spring. I hope that the Congress will act favorably on it.

Every effort is being made for more efficient production methods and better utilization of manpower to attain our maximum production goals. It would be a real impediment to war production if plants were unable to recruit their full complement of workers for lack of adequate shelter.

The balance of their authorized appropriation is required by the National Housing Agency to supply emergency needs in critical war-production areas.

Yours sincerely,

DONALD M. NELSON.

I also have a letter from Henry J. Kaiser, the most efficient production manager in the world today. Mr. Kaiser's letter reads:

OAKLAND, CALIF., November 4, 1943.

DEAR SIR: I hope that Congress acts favorably on your pending request for \$200,000,000 for war housing.

As you know, war housing is a matter of deep concern to us because of our production facilities in many States. Failure to get scheduled war housing definitely would prevent us from reaching production peaks. I am sure that others on the war-production front are faced with the same situation.

We must continue to seek the maximum utilization of manpower; we may find places where prospective needs for housing can be reduced. However, it has been my experience that the National Housing Agency has kept closely in touch with changing conditions and programed conservatively, utilizing existing housing and private financing wherever possible.

Regardless of the reduction in housing needs which may be possible here and there, I am confident there will be a net additional need which will require the funds you are asking.

At this critical period we should not find ourselves short of any of the facilities which may be necessary to speed victory.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY J. KAISER.

Mr. Chairman, there are no two men in America today in better position to pass on this question than Donald Nelson and Henry Kaiser. They not only know whereof they speak but neither has any personal interest to serve in the matter. Both are emphatic in recommending an appropriation of \$200,000,000. Both would consider \$50,000,000 as wholly inadequate much less the mere \$25,000,000 proposed by the amendment. The

amendment should be voted down. If any change is made it should be an increase.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILSON), there were—ayes 12, noes 84.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1944, for salaries and expenses, National Labor Relations Board (national defense), to perform the duties imposed upon it by the War Labor Disputes Act (Public Law 89, 78th Cong.), including the objects specified under this head in the National Labor Relations Board Appropriation Act, 1944, \$75,000.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time simply to call the attention of the House to the testimony of the National Labor Relations Board commencing at page 1029 of the committee hearings, referring to the administration of section 8 of the War Labor Disputes Act commonly referred to as the cooling-off period.

The record indicates that at the time of the hearings 318 strike notices had been received. Of these 197 had been withdrawn and 49 had been voted upon. In the 49 votes taken all but one or two resulted in a majority vote in favor of a strike. Actual strikes resulted, however, only in a half dozen cases.

The Congress will be interested in the following colloquy between the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and Mr. Reilly, a member of the National Labor Relations Board. I quote:

The CHAIRMAN. Have you had sufficient experience by this time to indicate the efficacy of this 30-day delay? Has it, in your opinion, merely delayed the strike 30 days, or has it resulted in expediting settlement of disputes without a strike?

Mr. REILLY. I should say the second. The fact that so few of these cases have resulted in actual strikes, I think may fairly be taken as an indication that the 30-day waiting period does offer opportunities for settlement which may have existed before to be sure, but I think by putting the agencies of adjustment on notice, it tends to expedite the holding of conferences and the work of the Conciliation Service.

The CHAIRMAN. In your opinion, then, this cooling-off period really cools off?

Mr. REILLY. I do not see very much evidence to the contrary, sir.

The Clerk read as follows:

Compiling census reports: For an additional amount for compiling census reports, and so forth, fiscal year 1944, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1944, and including sample surveys throughout the United States for the purpose of estimating the size and characteristics of the Nation's labor force, \$470,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: On page 18, after line 22, insert a new paragraph:

"Customs statistics: For an additional amount for customs statistics, fiscal year 1944, including the same objects specified under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1944, \$10,680."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is made necessary by an oversight in connection with a decision by the Comptroller General and action taken by the Civil Service Commission on reclassification of salaries.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Enforcement of safety regulations: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1944, for enforcement of safety regulations, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1944, \$64,000.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico: On page 20, after line 17, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"Development of landing areas: For the completion of landing area construction at public airports, including all necessary engineering and administrative expenses in the field in connection therewith, fiscal year 1944, \$6,756,918: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended at any public airport unless prior to the date of the enactment of this act construction has been undertaken at such airport with financial assistance from the Federal Government."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that it is expected that a number of amendments of this character will be offered, I wonder if we can reach an agreement at this time that the gentleman from New Mexico, representing the various Members who have amendments of this character in prospect, shall at this time present the case for them in 5 minutes, the other Members to be authorized to extend their remarks at this point in the Record. If that is agreeable, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, is the agreement that we be allowed to extend our remarks at this point in the Record?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. That all those who appeared before the committee and those interested in this matter be allowed to extend their remarks at this point.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is right.

Mr. STEFAN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close



in 10 minutes, the understanding being that all Members desiring to speak on the subject may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD, and that the last 5 minutes are reserved for the committee?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, this is a matter which has been before this House before. It passed the Senate of the United States last June and came back to the House in the closing hours of the session and was not favorably considered. Since that time the Members of the various congressional delegations have gone back to their areas and ascertained carefully the exact circumstances with reference to each one of these airports.

I wish to remind you that all of these airports were started as parts of a Federal W. P. A. program for the construction of ports, and with the liquidation of the W. P. A. these communities found the ports not completed and were therefore in need of this money to do the job. Bear in mind that no airport could be started at that time unless its military necessity was certified to by the Federal Government. Bear in mind that there was an engineer from the War Department who had been formerly chief engineer of W. P. A. whose sole job it was to clear these projects and to certify to them.

Let me call your attention to just one of these airports, that at Pueblo, Colo., which is represented by my good friend the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH]. At that airport \$745,000 was spent by the W. P. A.; \$125,000 was spent by the sponsor. When W. P. A. folded up, only \$70,000 was needed to complete that and make it a fine airport.

The same situation exists at every one of these other airports, for instance, at the airport at Raton, N. Mex., in my home State, where a great deal of work was done and a little bit of work remains. I can testify to you that as a field agent of W. P. A. I went into the Raton community and went into the Pueblo community and as part of a Nation-wide program urged these people to put up their money, and told them the Government would go on and see the project through.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not true that the expenditure of approximately \$6,000,000 is necessary in order to conserve an investment already made in excess of \$10,000,000?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The gentleman is entirely correct. The amount that has been spent by W. P. A. is \$7,165,092. The amount the communities have spent is \$3,051,025. It seems to me too bad to throw away \$10,000,000, on airports of all things, without properly taking care of that investment.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, who has been a vigorous sponsor through

this endeavor, as has the gentlemen from Nebraska, Mr. CURTIS and Mr. STEFAN.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Is it not a fact that the authorities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration feel that the money would be exceedingly well spent at this time?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Yes, they think that.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I wish to add I am very much for the amendment of the gentleman from New Mexico. One of the 24 airports is in my district at Henderson, Rusk County, Texas. The people there have spent \$97,400. The Federal Government has spent \$64,000. This is not a case dissimilar to any of the others, but certainly it seems to me, with this Nation going all-out on a civil aviation program, it is the part of wisdom to send \$6,000,000 after \$10,000,000. That is not sending good money after bad money; it is sending a relatively small amount of good money after a bigger amount of good money, all of which is for a mighty excellent purpose. With reference to the war effort, I do not see how any person here could have listened to what was told the Members of Congress by our military leaders recently with reference to aviation and say this is an item not needed. Twenty-four additional airports doubtless will serve a wonderfully good purpose in the future; if not for winning the war certainly so far as civil aviation is concerned.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Did not the expenditure of this W. P. A. fund for airports in the early days of our commercial aviation lay the foundation for the building of the greatest commercial air system the world has ever known?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I thank the gentleman for that very fine contribution, because it is exactly true.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Is it not also true that the gentleman's informal committee has very carefully gone over each and every one of these airport projects and is completely satisfied that no excessive funds are being asked for?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Yes. I will answer the gentleman by saying that after careful scrutiny we are convinced that no excessive funds are being asked for from any source.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Certainly.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the position of the War Department in regard to these airports at the present time?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The matter was not submitted to them, but the War Department certified to their military necessity before they were started.

Mr. DONDERO. That was under the W. P. A.?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Yes.

Mr. HINSHAW. I have none of these airports in my district, but I think it is vitally necessary to build them all for post-war purposes.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. The Civil Aeronautics Authority declared that these airports should be completed because they are wanted for national defense, and they recognize that in building them it is a matter of trying to save an investment of \$10,000,000.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. That is correct, and we have gone very carefully over these projects to make sure that each one is necessary. It should be remembered that the individual communities in every case put up the sponsor's contribution at the instigation of the Government that was then and is now trying to develop a program of airports throughout the country. The program for W. P. A. airports under C. A. A. supervision has been tremendously useful. Hundreds of airports have been finished and are being used today for flying schools. In my home city of Albuquerque there is a bombing school on a W. P. A. airfield, and there is another school where men are being trained for the trans-Atlantic ferrying of ships. Twenty-four of these W. P. A. airports remain, and we are asking for this money which the Civil Aeronautics Authority says is absolutely necessary for their completion. We hope that you will grant it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate these enterprising communities, on these forward-looking efforts to secure adequate airports. After the war is over a city which does not have an adequate and convenient airport will be as much out of the picture as a city without railroads and highways, but the day when we can build them at Federal Government expense has gone by, unless they are needed for military or naval purposes. This is a matter the House has twice acted upon—once, when it eliminated the W. P. A. root and branch, and again, when the matter was up on the second deficiency appropriation bill before the summer recess, when the House defeated an amendment carrying this identical matter on a yeand-nay vote.

If this were in any way connected with the war effort, and the pending bill is devoted almost exclusively to items related to the war program, they would not have to come here for money. Funds for such purposes are already available. If these projects are related to the war program all that is necessary is for these communities to appear before the Navy Department or the War Department and convince them that these airports are essential to or useful in the war program, and automatically the money is available. It already has been provided, but evidently these projects have no such classification.

I must confess to some surprise to find some of my friends supporting this



amendment. They were most emphatic in their opposition to W. P. A. and actively cooperated here on the floor in its elimination. They made perfect disestablishment and denial of funds for W. P. A. purposes, and here this afternoon they are, in effect, asking us to re-establish the W. P. A. and provide further appropriations.

If the construction of these few airports were all that is involved in this amendment, we might pass it over, but it involves more than the resuscitation of the W. P. A. It requires the scrapping of a policy carefully planned for the discontinuance of this character of public works, and if we continue W. P. A. work on these airports, there is in every congressional district in the United States numbers of similar projects, streets, roads, sewers, water systems, highways, public buildings, housing, hospitals, and schools that will immediately apply for the same consideration. It is utterly inconceivable that we should again at this critical time resume the operation of the W. P. A. in every nook and corner of the United States, because that is what is involved in this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the House has repeatedly rejected the principle embodied in this amendment. We would like to see these communities get their airports, but we must all realize that in these war-burdened, tax-ridden times the Government has enough on its hands to win the war, and the local communities are for the time being dependent on their own resources.

Of course, when the war is over, and peacetime conditions warrant it, the Federal Government may be in position to cooperate again in post-war construction.

In the meantime, I trust the Members of the House will support the committee and vote down the amendment.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Some of these airports are 90 percent completed, in which the Government has invested \$10,000,000. Government airplanes could land at those airports, some of which are in close proximity to Government forts, which would save many crashes. Does not the gentleman feel that for the sake of economy, those airports should be completed?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. They should be completed, but for the present not at Federal expense.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that permission has been granted to all Members.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, this item for completion of airports has been before this body several times. I have spoken a great deal for aviation and I feel deeply about the entire matter. No one in this House is more interested in eliminating useless expenditures than I am. But here is an item which will in

reality save money. Here are airports which are 90 percent completed. Airports which are needed for national defense. Airports which the C. A. A. says should be completed. Airports in which the Federal Government and local taxpayers have \$10,000,000 invested. With the requested expenditure in this amendment we have a chance to save the original investment. Some of these airports are eroding. They are needed, in my opinion, for present war efforts and for future aviation. They are so important that recently the Senate passed an amendment to complete them. Nearly 20 members of commerce have gone into the matter fully with their home communities, with the C. A. A. officials, and with the Subcommittee on Appropriations. I feel this expenditure will not only save our original investment but would result in completing in a very short time airports which are needed in our present emergency. To prove that I point to the fact that some of the airports in this original program have already been taken over by either the Army or the Navy. I sincerely hope that the membership will support us in the passage of this amendment.

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this amendment to appropriate funds for the completion of various airports throughout the United States. Measured by spending standards the amount of this appropriation item is very small, indeed. I am supporting the proposed amendment by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] because I believe that Congress already has an investment in these uncompleted airports, and it is only a matter of good business to protect that investment.

In July of this year, when the matter of an appropriation for uncompleted airports was before Congress, I supported the preferential motion. I will not here go into detail, but I simply want to say that I not only have not changed my mind but that I am more strongly than ever in favor of having Congress recognize the tremendous possibilities that will come from airport development in this country. The aviation industry is just in its infancy, and while we are spending billions of dollars for destructive war purposes now is the time to begin to plan to spend some money to build up our own country and to develop its possibilities. Nothing is more important than the planning to develop an aviation program. There should be a network of airports from east to west, and north to south. I discussed this at some length when the amendment was before Congress back in July.

All of this fits into the post-war planning program because there will be thousands and thousands of aviators returning from the present World War and jobs ought to be available for them in the aviation program. I hope that the short-sighted suggestion that a similar amendment was defeated in July constitutes an argument for a repetition of that mistake will be discarded by the Members of the House of Representatives. These funds ought to be provided

and every argument made in favor of the appropriation in July is in point at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STEFAN) there were yeas 59 and nays 62.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico and Mr. STEFAN demanded tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chair appointed Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico and Mr. CANNON of Missouri to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were yeas 77 and nays 78.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

##### SOLID FUELS ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for the Solid Fuels Administration for War, fiscal year 1944, including the objects specified under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1944, \$950,000; and the limitation upon the number of technical employees who may be employed without regard to civil service and classification laws is hereby increased from 18 to 25.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I take this occasion to call attention to the testimony of the Solid Fuels Administration for War commencing at page 410 of the committee hearings.

The agency paints a very grave national and for that matter world picture in respect to coal both anthracite and bituminous. The record indicates that reserves are down some 20,000,000 tons. It estimates also a deficit for the year as the result of decreased production of 39,000,000 tons. It reflects a loss of skilled manpower during the past year to the extent of 75,000 workers and more recently at the rate of 4,000 skilled workers a month. The War Manpower Commission has apparently been helpless in relieving substantially the manpower problem. The record also reflects an estimated loss of about 1,000,000 tons of coal a month due to "slow down" primarily because of the lack of wage contracts for the workers in the mine to work under. The War Labor Board until recently, at least, seems to have been helpless in finding a solution for this aspect of the situation.

The agency predicts a desperate condition in the absence of additional production before the first of the year. It is to be hoped that recent developments will be conducive to this end.

The record shows a loss in production attributable to the interruption last summer amounting to 28,000,000 tons of coal—3,000,000 tons of anthracite, 25,000,000 tons of bituminous.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ENGEL of Michigan was granted permission to extend his own remarks at this point.)

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, when the War Department civil functions appropriation bill for the year 1944 was being considered by the subcommittee, a great deal of testimony was taken with regard to the advisability of



constructing a barge canal across the State of Florida. According to the proponents of the bill, the canal would cost \$44,000,000. The Chief of Engineers of the United States Army testified the cost would be approximately \$60,000,000. After considerable controversy, the subcommittee recommended an appropriation for \$44,000,000 for that purpose to the full committee. On March 31, 1943, the full Appropriations Committee, on my motion struck the item from the bill. The War civil functions appropriations bill passed the House on April 1, 1943. After prolonged hearings, and due consideration in the Senate committee, the bill was passed by the Senate without the canal item, and on June 2, 1943, it was approved by the President and became a law. No one offered to amend the bill on the floor of the House to restore this item, nor was any effort made, as I recall the facts, to amend the bill by putting the item in the bill in the Senate.

On July 1, within 30 days after the bill was passed, and after the House of Representatives through its committee, they refused to appropriate funds for this canal, the President of the United States wrote a letter to the Honorable JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives, in which he used in part the following language:

As yet, it has not been feasible to undertake work on sections of the waterway not now in existence, primarily because of shortages of manpower, materials, and equipment. Detailed plans and specifications for the Florida barge canal will be prepared so that its construction can proceed without delay as soon as these shortages are overcome.

I am including a copy of this letter herein. The President said nothing about waiting for an appropriation being made by this Congress. On March 31, 1943, I issued the following statement giving a summary of the testimony before our subcommittee and the facts which induced me to oppose this appropriation:

#### PERTINENT FACTS ON FLORIDA BARGE CANAL

1. Cost: According to the proponents of the bill, the canal would cost \$44,000,000. The Chief Engineer of the United States Army says \$60,000,000.

2. Proponents say it would cost \$451,250,000 to build the canal, including equipment units, such as barges, tugs, etc., to transport 1,600,000 barrels daily (p. 145 of the hearings). R. K. Davis, Deputy Petroleum Administrator, itemizes the cost at \$1,522,625,000. (See p. 175 of hearings.)

3. Canal proponents' figures are based upon 65 percent of the tugs and barges being constructed of wood and 35 percent steel. The Petroleum Administrator's office says only heavy residual oil or about 10 percent of the total can be transported by wooden barges and 90 percent would require steel barges; that no wooden barges could be used because of the various hazards, including fire hazard (pp. 173-176 of the hearings; p. 159 of the hearings). Both parties base their figures upon the assumption that the total requirement of 1,600,000 barrels per day is to be transported by canal, which, of course, would not be true, as 535,000 barrels will be transported next year by pipe line. Assuming that 50 percent is to be transported, you would, of course, cut each figure down to 50 percent, or whatever percentage of the oil that is to be transported by canal.

#### COST OF TRANSPORTATION

By tanker before the war, 21 to 24 cents per barrel.

Present cost of transporting by tanker as fixed by Maritime Commission, 40 cents per barrel.

Cost of transporting by rail, \$1.65 per barrel.

Cost of transporting by canal, \$1 per barrel.

Cost of transporting by pipe line, 35 cents per barrel.

No subsidy will be paid on pipe-line transportation, and the 35 cents per barrel would be paid by consumer and would liquidate the entire investment within 5 years (p. 198 of the hearings).

#### SUBSIDIES

The subsidy is the difference between the tanker cost fixed by the Maritime Commission at 40 cents per barrel and the actual transportation cost. Under canal transportation, subsidy would still be paid of 60 cents per barrel, which is the difference between present tanker transportation cost and canal transportation cost (p. 169 of the hearings).

#### INVESTMENT

Government capital would have to be used. No private individuals or corporations will invest money in barges and tugs to transport oil at \$1 per barrel when tankers can transport the oil at 21 to 24 cents per barrel in peacetime and pipe lines at 35 cents per barrel, including amortization of capital investment of pipe lines in 5 years. Capital invested in barges and tugs would be a loss after the war.

It would cost \$3 a barrel to transport oil in drums through the canal (p. 170 of the hearings).

#### NEW METHODS OF TRANSPORTATION AVAILABLE IN 1943

1. Pipe lines: One 24-inch pipe line to be completed July 4; capacity 300,000 barrels per day. This pipe line can be stepped up to 450,000 per day (pp. 149 and 158 of the hearings).

One 20-inch pipe line as far as Illinois by September and through to the East by December. This pipe line will transport 235,000 barrels daily without subsidy at 35 cents per barrel paid by the consumer and liquidate the total investment in 5 years (p. 198 of the hearings). This is additional capacity over what we had last year.

2. Supplying oil to the East: Mr. Wilson, of the Petroleum Administrator's office, stated that when these two pipe lines are completed "we will be able to meet the full east-coast petroleum requirements on the basis of continuing gasoline rationing substantially as it now is and supply normal requirements of fuel oil and other petroleum requirements for domestic and offshore use" (p. 199 of the hearings).

#### STEEL

Under date of March 24, 1943, Mr. Ralph K. Davis, Deputy Petroleum Administrator, wrote me as follows:

"At present, a program calling for ultimate construction of some 500 wooden barges and 100 tugs is in process of completion under the direction of the Office of Defense Transportation. This program was authorized in December 1942. At present, contracts for the construction of some 80 tugs and about 280 wooden barges have been let to various yards. The time necessary to construct a single barge ranges from 40 days to 3 months, and for a tug, from 4 to 6 months. It would be impossible to arrive at an accurate time estimate covering the construction of 9,600 barges and 3,995 tugs unless one could base one's estimate on the number of yards available in which the work could be done, and the number of vessels which each yard would undertake to build simultaneously.

"It is the opinion of this office, however, that with existing yard facilities and with the projects already under construction and

authorized which now are utilizing the capacity of such shipyards, it is questionable whether or not sufficient equipment could be constructed within a period of 2 years which would be capable of moving an additional 200,000 B/D from Texas gulf ports to Trenton, N. J., let alone moving 1,500,000 B/D.

"It should be pointed out that the use of steel for large diameter pipe-line construction involves minimum interference with either the shipbuilding program of the Maritime Commission, the barge conversion program of the Office of Defense Transportation, or with the production of bombs. The barge and shipbuilding program is predicated upon the use of rolled plate, while the large diameter pipe-line program is predicated principally upon the use of drawn tubing, which is produced in separate mills not capable of producing rolled plate. It is interesting to note that in the construction of the 24-inch war emergency pipe line, the question arose as to the possible interference this construction might have upon the bomb program. Drawing of pipe for the "big inch" line was stopped for a sufficient period of time to permit the drawing of necessary bomb casings to meet the requirements of the armed forces. Drawing of pipe for the "big inch" line was then resumed. Similarly, it is believed that no interference would arise in a future possible expansion of the presently planned large pipe-line program."

Space will not permit me to quote other testimony. However, I had Mr. Buckman, representing the proponents, give me a statement covering the main items of cost. I then had Mr. Davis, Petroleum Administrator, and the Government authorities take that statement and give their side by way of comparison. You will find the comparison on pages 172 to 176 of the hearings. If you will read just these four pages, it will give you a complete story. I have no desire except to give you the facts.

The War Department civil functions appropriation bill for 1944 contained an item of \$3,000,000 appropriated for the purpose of having the Corps of Engineers make surveys to prepare plans and specifications for projects which might provide post-war work. This \$3,000,000 was supposed to cover work in the entire United States.

To my amazement and surprise, I was informed recently that the Chief of Engineers had used a part of these funds to prepare plans and specifications to build the Florida barge canal. I telephoned Maj. Gen. Thomas M. Robins, Acting Chief of Engineers, and asked for a complete statement, which I am including herein. He informed me that the Corps of Engineers had allocated \$1,000,000, or one-third of this \$3,000,000 which was intended to cover the entire United States, to prepare construction plans and specifications for the Florida barge canal. This statement was later verified in writing as per letter hereto attached. The Chief of Engineers testified before our committee, and he knew very well that the Appropriations Committee had refused to make this appropriation for the Florida barge canal. For him to allocate one-third of the entire amount intended to be used for plans and specifications throughout the United States, for a project which had been rejected by the committee, shows a contempt for the committee's position that cannot be justified. The Chief of Engineers must believe that the \$60,000,000 that he says it will require to build this canal will be



forthcoming from some place. Certainly, the action of the Appropriations Committee did not encourage him in his belief; or did the President of the United States order the survey to be made?

The President's statement in his letter of July 1 that—

Detailed plans and specifications for the Florida barge canal will be prepared so its construction can proceed without delay as soon as these shortages—manpower, materials, and equipment—are overcome—

Leads me to believe that it was the President who ordered this survey made. It is interesting to note that the President did not say that the canal will be built when Congress appropriated the money. Can it be that he is intending to use funds that Congress appropriated for other purposes and entrusted him with to build this canal? I have not forgotten that after Congress refused to appropriate more than \$35,000,000 for the Pentagon Building he used funds appropriated for other purposes to build that building.

The following is a copy of the letter written me by the Acting Chief of Engineers:

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,  
Washington, November 2, 1943.  
Hon. ALBERT J. ENGEL,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ENGEL: Referring to your recent telephone call, I am pleased to furnish the following information regarding the work presently underway in connection with the Florida barge canal.

The Department recently established a field office at Ocala, Fla., for the purpose of preparing construction plans and specifications for the authorized Florida barge canal. The activities include subsurface explorations, hydraulic investigations, design of structures and other field investigations and studies required for the preparation of detailed plans for this waterway. A considerable amount of advance investigation is necessary in view of the nature of the ground formations in the section of Florida through which the canal will be built. Funds in the amount of \$1,000,000 have been allotted with which to carry out the work now in progress. Initiation of actual construction operations is dependent upon the appropriation of necessary funds therefor.

Funds for such investigation and design studies for the Florida barge canal as are being undertaken at this time were made available under the provisions of the War Department Civil Appropriation Act approved June 2, 1943 (Public Law, 64, 78th Cong.), making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, for civil functions administered by the War Department, which provided that "\$3,000,000 of the unobligated balance on June 30, 1943, of the appropriation 'Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works' is hereby made available for the execution of detailed investigations and the preparation of plans and specifications for projects heretofore or hereafter authorized." As you know, the project for the construction of a high-level lock barge canal from the St. Johns River across Florida to the Gulf of Mexico was adopted by the act of Congress approved July 23, 1942 (Public Law, 675, 77th Cong.).

I trust that the information furnished herein will clarify the status of this project. Should additional information be desired, I

shall be pleased to furnish it, if available, upon receipt of your further request.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS M. ROBINS,  
Major General, Acting Chief of Engineers.

In reading this letter by Major General Robins, I noted the following language:

The activities include subsurface explorations, hydraulic investigations, design of structures, and other field investigations and studies required for the preparation of detailed plans for this waterway. A considerable amount of advance investigation is necessary in view of the nature of the ground formations in the section of Florida through which the canal will be built.

I telephoned General Robins and asked him to explain this paragraph. He informed me—

That this survey could be used for a ship canal. The same kind of a survey is used for the barge canal and the ship canal.

I asked him, "All you have to do then to get a ship canal is to throw out the locks and deepen the canal?" and his answer was "Yes."

In view of the fact that this barge canal is built on practically the same site as the old ship canal site, can there be any doubt but what the next step will be "to throw out the locks and deepen the canal" to make it a ship canal?

It seems to me that in view of the testimony of the Chief of Engineers that it would take several years to build this canal and in view of the difficulty of the Ways and Means Committee is having in raising taxes and the requirement for manpower, I cannot bring myself to believe that the Chief of Engineers would order one-third of the entire amount appropriated for plans, surveys, and specifications by the Department for a project of this type unless the orders came from the Commander in Chief of the Army, the President of the United States.

The following is a copy of the letter from the President to Judge Mansfield hereinbefore referred to:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, July 1, 1943.  
Hon. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD,  
Chairman, Committee on  
Rivers and Harbors,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE MANSFIELD: I have received your letter of May 25, 1943, regarding the need for improvement of the Atlantic-Gulf intra-coastal waterway, and, in particular, the need for construction of the Florida barge canal.

I have always realized the importance of an adequate and continuous inland waterway for barge traffic along our Atlantic seaboard and Gulf coast. Upon authorization of such a waterway by Congress, steps were taken promptly to initiate the improvement and work has been carried on as fast as possible without interfering with the war effort. This work has consisted of large-scale dredging operations along the existing sections of the waterway, which, without improvement, could not be used to full capacity. It is my intention to continue these dredging improvements during the next fiscal year.

As yet, it has not been feasible to undertake work on sections of the waterway not now in existence, primarily because of shortages of manpower, materials, and equipment. Detailed plans and specifications for the Florida barge canal will be prepared so that its construction can proceed without delay as

soon as these shortages are overcome. While I cannot foretell how soon that will be, it is possible that the situation with respect to these shortages will change sufficiently to permit an early dredging of the sea-level sections of the canal, and I am, accordingly, asking the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Chief of Engineers to keep me advised of any changes of conditions which would justify the inauguration of this work.

I appreciate the further expression in your letter of May 25 of your continued concern with the improvement of our waterway system, to the development of which you have contributed so much.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Patrick Henry National Monument: For completion of the acquisition of the estate of Patrick Henry in Charlotte County, Va., known as Red Hill, including expenses incidental to such acquisition, in accordance with the provisions of the acts of August 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 652), and January 29, 1940 (54 Stat. 18), fiscal year 1944, \$25,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: On page 25, strike out lines 18 to 24, inclusive.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, before the final vote was taken in the Deficiency Subcommittee on Appropriations having jurisdiction over the pending measure I made one reservation and one only. I reserved the right to offer the amendment that I have just submitted to eliminate a \$25,000 item for the completion of the acquisition of the estate of Patrick Henry in Charlotte County, Va., known as Red Hill.

On yesterday I gave notice to Members of the House that I would offer such an amendment. The reasons are obvious and I shall not take the full time allotted me in support of this amendment. Suffice it to say that this is an Interior Department item, considered at length by that subcommittee in connection with the regular annual appropriation bill, and was unanimously rejected.

If Members will turn to page 328 and the several pages following giving a history of this transaction, I am sure that abundant proof will be found that the Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations, of which I have the honor of being chairman, acted wisely in unanimously rejecting it. Certainly, it has no connection with the war effort, and the purchase of an estate of 960 acres of land, much of which is cut-over acreage, which it was testified would hardly grow bumblebee cotton or black-eyed peas, will neither add to the prestige of the Congress at this critical period in the Nation's history, nor further endear the name of the immortal Patrick Henry to the hearts and minds of patriotic liberty-loving citizens of America.

As stated yesterday, the Director of the National Park Service assured the committee that it did not initiate this project and did not need 960 acres for a memorial to Patrick Henry. The hearings give abundant proof that all members of the Subcommittee on Interior



Department Appropriations were correct in their unanimous opposition to unloading another white elephant on the taxpayers of the country and that they are justified in being wholly dissatisfied with the transaction. I am also advised that the owners of the estate have now become dissatisfied. Considering the evidence presented, I am very definitely and strongly of the opinion that the taxpayers of the country would be dissatisfied should this appropriation stand. Furthermore, I see no Member of Congress here who is sufficiently interested to defend the item under the existing circumstances.

Therefore, without any further comment, I ask for a vote on my amendment.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the able and distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. We ought to get along without memorials in wartime. Wait until we get through with the war before we begin to spread out on that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am glad to be able to agree with the gentleman on this item, even though we did not see eye to eye on another provision of the bill. I agree that it is a bad policy to be erecting memorials in wartime. In this connection let me say that the Interior Department Subcommittee on Appropriations having jurisdiction over memorials of this kind refused to appropriate a single dollar for the purpose of investigating future memorials. That is the firm policy of our committee. I think I can safely say that Interior Department appropriation bills in the future will contain no funds for investigating or erecting memorials, at least for the duration.

And now that no one appears sufficiently interested to—

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I beg to differ with the gentleman. We are interested. The fact is I also have an amendment on the Clerk's desk similar to the gentleman's amendment. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I was going to say that now no one is sufficiently interested to defend this item, and since it is our firm and determined policy not to erect memorials at this time in our Nation's history that it is unnecessary to prolong the debate.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to say that I am in full accord with what the gentleman has said and I trust that this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman and am confident that it will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Damage claims: For the payment of claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property adjusted and determined by the Attorney General of the United States under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the adjustment and settlement of certain claims arising out of the activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation," approved March 20, 1936 (49 Stat. 1184), as fully set forth in House Document No. 323, Seventy-eighth Congress, §253.58.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. If the membership of the Committee of the Whole will indulge me for just a moment, I would like to make an observation on a matter that is not especially germane to this paragraph.

I hope there will be no objection on the part of the members of the committee. I do so at this point, however, because for some time I have been interested in the restoration of the power of review to the Federal courts of the country in connection with the Office of Price Administration. Now it has come to my attention only today that a model ordinance has been prepared by or for or at the suggestion of the O. P. A. to be sent to the city councils of all cities and villages of the country. It is an ordinance so drafted that it would make unlawful under local ordinances any violation whatsoever of any price ceiling or of any rent ceiling or the exchange of goods without necessary coupons, and would virtually incorporate in local law every order, regulation, and price schedule that has been issued by the Office of Price Administration.

The interesting thing about it also is that it contains a punitive provision. It makes any violation in such an ordinance an offense which would be punishable by a fine not to exceed \$200 or 90 days in prison, or both. If this is true it presents a rather amazing situation. It seems to me that it necessarily ought to have some attention and investigation because the model ordinances have been pretty well scattered over the country. It will be a rather interesting thing when Federal law and local law are so mixed, jurisdiction so mixed, enforcement so mixed that the local magistrate then becomes the enforcement official for all the regulations issued from Washington irrespective of whether he has an up-to-date file of all orders and regulations or not.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman knows that the O. P. A. is constantly amending its regulations. Is the local body to pass the act as it exists now or is the local body merely to pass an ordinance that they will enforce all future regulations of O. P. A.?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The local body would enforce everything by way of regulations whether they had been adopted up to that time or were subsequently adopted, for otherwise such an ordinance could not have full creditable effect. It

would be a very interesting development in our law. I am going to extend a copy of this ordinance in the Record that all men may see.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Does not the gentleman think that according to the election returns last Tuesday a good many of these localities from the gentleman's standpoint will take care of themselves and not be apt to be overcome by the O. P. A.?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say to my genial and gracious friend that I am not very much interested in this from the standpoint of election returns. I am interested in this from the standpoint of the man who may be put out of business by O. P. A. regulations. He cannot today go into Federal court because this Congress by solemn decree has divested the Federal courts of jurisdiction to hear any cases involving regulations, orders, or price schedules; but on the other hand they propose in a series of ordinances throughout the country to make violation of an O. P. A. regulation a criminal offense under a local ordinance and haul everybody before the local magistrate or perhaps into Federal court; so the law is all one-sided and it is against the citizen, and this may be just another move in a further direction.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. I think the gentleman need not fear that communities inhabited by men like him will be overcome by this terrible octopus.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank my friend for that gracious compliment.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Has the gentleman any information that any city or village in the United States has adopted such ordinance?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; but I am informed that these model ordinances are already in the hands of some village officials and are at least receiving attention.

Mr. DONDERO. One other question: Does that mean that a citizen can be brought into court under an ordinance before he finds out what some order is here in Washington?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; although he may never have heard of the order or regulation, if this kind of ordinance were adopted.

Mr. DONDERO. It is an absurdity.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. Would the ordinance provide any way of testing the constitutionality of any rule or regulation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; there is no such provision in the sample ordinance that is before me at the present time and which I intend to insert in the Record where all may see.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?



Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Does the gentleman believe that the O. P. A. will furnish the order to the local prosecutor after an ordinance such as this is adopted?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was going to say that the reason I brought this in under the Department of Justice item in this bill was because it presents some very strange and mixed enforcement problems.

This new move might be interpreted as a confession of failure to regulate the affairs of people from Washington and that it might be better to rely on home rule. But the essential point is that every O. P. A. regulation would by such an ordinance have the effect of law for a violation of which, a person might be punished. But think of the huge volume of regulations to be considered by a local magistrate. It presents a very interesting situation.

There follows a copy of the proposed ordinance:

Ordinance 1078 (a)

An ordinance to prevent and suppress violations of any orders, regulations, or schedules, in effect on the effective date of this ordinance, or which shall hereinafter be in effect, pertaining to rationed commodities, maximum prices, or maximum rents, issued by the United States of America, by the Office of Price Administration, under the authority of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, or as may hereinafter be amended, or by any other agency thereof, under the acts of the Congress of the United States of America

Whereas it is necessary for the health, safety, and general welfare of the inhabitants of the ----- of ----- that during the present emergency commodity prices and the cost-of-living accommodations shall be stabilized and commodities shall be equitably distributed; and

Whereas the United States of America, through the Office of Price Administration and other agencies, has issued orders, regulations, and price schedules which are designed to effect such equitable distribution and stabilization of prices: Now, therefore, pursuant to the provisions of Revised Statutes 40:48-2 of New Jersey

The ----- of the ----- of ----- do ordain:

1. That no person shall sell, offer for sale, or deliver at wholesale or retail any commodity of service for which a maximum price has been or hereafter may be prescribed by any regulation, order, or price schedule or any amendment thereof issued by the Office of Price Administration under the authority of the acts of the Congress of the United States of America known as the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as now amended, at prices in excess of the applicable maximum price prescribed by the applicable regulation, order, or price schedule of the Office of Price Administration.

2. That no person shall sell, offer for sale, transfer, or deliver a commodity rationed by an order or any amendment thereof, heretofore or hereafter issued by the United States of America by the Office of Price Administration, under the authority of acts of Congress of the United States of America, without taking the coupons, stamps, certificates, ration books, or other ration evidences prescribed by the applicable regulation or order in force and effect at the time of the transaction.

(b) That no person shall possess, acquire, transfer, or otherwise dispose of any ration

coupons, stamps, certificates, ration books, or other ration evidences pertaining to any commodity rationed by any such order, or any amendment thereof, except in the manner prescribed by the applicable regulations or order in force and effect at the time of the transaction.

3. That no owner shall rent any housing accommodation for which a maximum rent has been prescribed by any regulation or order issued by the Office of Price Administration under the authority of the acts of the Congress of the United States of America known as the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, at a rent in excess of the applicable maximum rent prescribed by the applicable regulation or order of the Office of Price Administration.

(4. All complaints to be made to local O. P. A. price board. If they decide the violation is serious, they may prosecute in local courts as below.)

4. That any person who shall violate any of the provisions of this ordinance shall be subject to a fine of not exceeding the sum of \$200, or by imprisonment for a term not exceeding 90 days, or both, for each such violation, in the discretion of the magistrate.

5. That if any provision of this ordinance, or the application of any provision of this ordinance to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the ordinance and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

6. That the provisions of this ordinance with regard to violations of price regulations, price schedules, and orders shall remain in force and effect so long as the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, or as hereafter amended, is in force and effect. The provisions of this ordinance with regard to violators of rationing orders shall remain in force and effect so long as the Second War Powers Act of 1942, or as the same be hereafter amended, shall remain in force and effect.

7. That the term "person" includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, or any other organized group of persons, or legal successor or representative of any of the foregoing.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS

Naval stock fund: For the purpose of increasing the capital of the "Naval Stock Fund," the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to transfer the sum of \$750,000,000 from the appropriation "Ordnance and Ordnance Stores, Navy, 1944," to the "Naval Stock Fund": *Provided*, That after June 30, 1944, the value of stock in the "Naval Stock Account" plus the outstanding obligations under the "Naval Stock Fund" shall not exceed \$2,250,000,000 at any time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAGNUSON:

On page 28, after line 15, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS

"The appropriation 'Public Works Bureau of Yards and Docks,' shall be available for the payment of compensation of those employees of contractors who are known to have been taken by an enemy as a prisoner, hostage, or otherwise, while employed on Wake Island, at such rates as the Secretary of the Navy may determine to be equitable and just (not to exceed the rates of wages being paid for comparable positions to employees of the Navy Department in areas nearest to

the places of employment of such contractors' employees at the time of their having been taken by an enemy), until such time as such employees may be returned to such places as may be provided for in their contracts of employment: *Provided*, That no compensation shall be payable after the death of such an employee has been established or can be legally presumed to have occurred: *Provided further*, That compensation paid in pursuance hereof, to be effected by or through the contractor, shall be in lieu of any payments authorized by Public, No. 784, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 2, 1942."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I presented this matter last night in the Record so that the Members who were not here could read it, because it involves not only the technicality but it also deals with legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is this the same language exactly that the gentleman submitted last night?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. I may say to the gentleman from New York that it is the same language and the same amendment.

Mr. TABER. It is simply designed to correct an injustice that has resulted in connection with the civilian employees out on Wake Island?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Do I understand that this comes with the unanimous consent of the gentleman's committee? That is, everyone you have here is in favor of it?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. The chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs is here, and I yield to him.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If the gentleman from Washington will permit me to make this statement, I think it is important to say that some time ago the gentleman from Washington introduced a bill dealing with this subject matter. The Committee on Naval Affairs is engaged in several investigations, and it has been impossible to get the committee together, but the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and myself have consulted the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] and other members of the committee who are in town, and, recognizing the urgency of this legislation to do justice to these people, I suggested to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] that he offer his amendment to this appropriation bill. We recognize the fact that it is subject to a point of order, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, but it would be next March before we could get an appropriation bill before us, even though we passed the authorization act doing what this amendment proposes to do at this time. I am gratified to know, after conference with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER], and the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, that there is no objection, so far as the Committee on Appropriations is concerned, to accepting this amendment, and I hope the House will agree to it and



permit justice to be done to the families of these people who were taken prisoners while engaged in Navy work at Guam and at Wake.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs and the gentleman from Washington also took this matter up with the Speaker and myself. I understand also the matter has been cleared with the Republican members of the subcommittee and, I assume, the Republican leadership; is that right?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. This is an amendment to correct an oversight. While it is a little unusual, the emergency requires it, and I hope that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I say to the committee it is estimated that there are some 1,146 civilian employees of contractors who are prisoners of Japan. The whole purpose of this amendment is to compensate them under such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Navy determines to be just and fair, or to compensate their families while they are prisoners of war. Under the law now, whenever a soldier or sailor is taken prisoner the Government continues to pay that enlisted man or officer his compensation right along as if he were in line of duty.

Mr. MAGNUSON. May I say here the contractors are willing to pay these men. They were working there on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis, but their contract of employment provided for employment and that they would be paid from the time they left continental United States until the time they came back. The Navy is willing to pay them; they feel their moral obligation, but they also feel they cannot pay them legally because they are not being employed. They are prisoners of war. Many of them may be dead.

The Congress in March of this year passed a bill providing that prisoners of war, military and civil-service employees, shall be paid the amount of their salary while they are prisoners. These people were left out. We have been trying to pay them under the Workmen's Compensation Act. We have called them longshoremen in order to pay a dribbling amount to their dependents. Some of the situations are getting desperate. I may say that the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] called this to our attention some weeks ago. It is a condition that should be rectified immediately.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman knows I also had a bill with his committee to provide for the same thing. We have 372 of these families from California alone; that is, families of men taken on Wake. I trust the House will approve this amendment, and I am de-

lighted to hear the statement of the chairman of the gentleman's committee.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In discussing this with other members of the Committee on Naval Affairs, we feel highly complimented that the Members have agreed to take this thing up and straighten it out immediately. I hope the House will adopt the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I want to compliment the gentleman from Washington because the justice of his amendment is not only meritorious but necessary to care for the families of the 1,180 civilians taken at Guam and Wake Island, approximately one-third of whom came from my state of Montana. These men are now prisoners of war in Japanese camps suffering untold hardships. I know that when the Japanese invaded Wake and Guam they dropped their shovels, left their bulldozers and trucks, and armed themselves with rifles to defend American soil. They fought courageously and gloriously in our behalf and this act on the part of this Congress is in recognition of their valiant and courageous worth. We of Montana are proud of them.

While it may appear that I speak selfishly because so many of them came from my State, I do not, because I think this is a just debt we owe to all these people, no matter where they come from.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I was not here when the gentleman's amendment was read, being temporarily out of the room. What does it do for the widow or child of the boy who happened to be killed over there?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Secretary pays them a wage comparable to that which would be paid a man working in a navy yard in the same capacity, until the time we get some word that they are dead or are presumed to be legally dead. We have no knowledge where these contract employees, now civilian prisoners, are, where they have been taken. We do not think they are still on Wake, because we have made some forays over Wake Island and we do not think they are there. Some of them may be dead, but the families do not know it. Many of these families are desperate and many of them are destitute. If and when we find out they are dead, then, of course, under the Workmen's Compensation Act,

the families will receive a stipulated amount. I do not know exactly what it is, but they are protected under death benefit provisions.

Mr. GILCHRIST. That is exactly the situation I want to know about. A neighbor in my little town lost her husband there. We cannot hear from him, and suppose he is dead.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We hope these men are not dead. We hope the Japanese are treating them as prisoners of war. Maybe that is wishful thinking. They were from all walks of life and were doing an installation job on Wake when the Japs came in. I think many of them will come back.

Mr. GILCHRIST. If he has been killed the widow should be entitled to compensation under the Workmen's Compensation Act.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Most of these contracts of employment contain some benefit provisions, insurance and otherwise. I do not recall the exact terms.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. I commend the gentleman for offering this amendment. A good many of these men are from my district and are in the position the gentleman has mentioned. I have had a great deal of correspondence in connection with them. Their families are unable to get compensation from any source and in a good many cases are unable to determine whether the men are still alive. I think the Government ought to make provision for them under the circumstances.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Committee on Appropriations for doing this very humane thing.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, as is well known, it is the policy of the Committee on Appropriations to refuse all amendments proposing legislation. This amendment proposes legislation, and therefore is subject to a point of order.

But in view of its sponsorship by the committee having jurisdiction of the subject, the great Committee on Naval Affairs, and its approval by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] we will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask that we now return to page 9 and take up the paragraph under Employees' Compensation Commission, which was passed over on the reading of the bill awaiting action upon this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Under a previous order of the Committee, the Clerk will read that paragraph at this time.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

Employees' compensation fund: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1944, for the payment of compensation provided by the act of



September 7, 1916 (5 U. S. C. 785), as amended, including the objects specified under this head in the Employees' Compensation Commission Appropriation Act, 1944, \$3,000,000, which, together with the amount heretofore appropriated under this head, shall be available also for reimbursement payments authorized by the act of December 2, 1942 (42 U. S. C. 1701), rehabilitation expenses and fees or payments to other agencies of the United States and other public agencies or private persons, agencies, or institutions, for services, or facilities rendered by them pursuant to agreement and approved by the Commission.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.  
The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: On page 9, line 19, strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert "\$2,500,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered in conformity with the amendment just adopted by the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 205. For the payment of claims allowed by the General Accounting Office pursuant to the act entitled "An act for the relief of officers and soldiers of the volunteer service of the United States mustered into service for the War with Spain, and who were held in service in the Philippine Islands after the ratification of the treaty of peace, April 11, 1899," approved May 2, 1940 (Public Act No. 505, 76th Cong.), and which have been certified to the Seventy-eighth Congress under section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884 (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 266), under the War Department in House Document No. 317, \$2,880.82.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, since the guayule rubber project was authorized by the President on March 5, 1942, the Congress has appropriated approximately \$45,000,000 for the continuance of this project. I understand from a reading of the hearings that a request was made for an additional \$7,500,000 in this bill, and that has been refused by the committee. I have no quarrel with the Committee on Appropriations for the action taken, but if I may have the attention of the chairman of the committee, I do want to ask a few questions in connection with the attitude of the committee on this project.

A reading of the hearings discloses that both the Baruch committee and the Rubber Administrator, Mr. Jeffers, urged that this project be continued as an insurance policy. I wonder if the chairman of the committee would care to tell me just what the attitude of the Committee on Appropriations is toward this entire project at this time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The committee provided in former bills \$45,000,000, in full of the estimates submitted by the Budget Bureau for this purpose. However, the question involved in this last estimate was whether or not rubber could be produced in merchantable quantities before the close of the war. In the course of the hearings they testi-

fied they could not produce rubber in appreciable quantities before 1946, and in view of the fact that the war is not expected to last that long and the cost of rubber produced by the guayule method would be too expensive to compete with imported rubber after the war, the committee doubted the advisability of enlarging the program at this time.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Do I correctly understand, Mr. Chairman, that the committee is not opposed to the continuance of the project as a post-war insurance measure? Guayule is the only source of raw rubber available within the continental limits of the United States. The committee's attitude is not opposed to the continuance of the project at a later date? Is that correct?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The last proposal differs slightly from the original plan. Under this estimate individual landowners in various sections of the country were to be encouraged to grow the plant as a new industry. The proposition involved such a material change in policy that the committee hesitated to embark upon such an experiment at this time.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. They also proposed a good deal of work in other States where they had not even started any work, and they were planning to stop some work where they are now doing it, moving it to new States with the idea of carrying it on as a new development in those States and as an agricultural job following the close of the war.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman that I have today introduced a resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to thoroughly investigate this entire guayule program, and report back its recommendations, and such changes in the legislation as may be necessary. I trust I may have the concurrence of the Committee on Appropriations in such an endeavor, because I think that is the only way we can find out where we are going in the production of guayule, and I think it is well worth following it up as a post-war project.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I think I may say that the committee will agree, insofar as the proposition relates to the prosecution of the war and the production of war material in time for practical use. Of course, so far as legislation is concerned, the proposition falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I think all of us appreciate the splendid work the gentleman has done in the promotion of the cultivation of the guayule plant. In that connection I want to say

that in my congressional district there is a lot of guayule that grows wild.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I am aware of that.

Mr. THOMASON. In fact some years ago there was a rubber plant at Marathon, Tex.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That is correct.

Mr. THOMASON. And later there was so much raw rubber imported, that they were not able to make a success of the plant.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. All of the guayule that was in the gentleman's district was exploited, and the rubber plant had to be closed down for lack of supplies.

Mr. THOMASON. Yes. I may say to the gentleman that I express the hope that there is some encouragement for the preservation of the guayule plants in his State, and in west Texas, and perhaps some part of California, also in New Mexico, because those plants ought not to be destroyed.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That is correct. I hope the Committee on Agriculture will act on my resolution and make a thorough investigation and report back to the House.

Mr. THOMASON. I join with the gentleman in expressing that hope, and also offer him my hearty cooperation.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I rise to support the suggestion of my colleague from California [Mr. ANDERSON] on the subject of guayule. It is my very sincere hope that his resolution, which proposes a committee to investigate this very much misunderstood subject, will be approved by the House and that such an investigation may be made.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I rise to disabuse the gentleman's mind of the thought that this is a special committee. It simply authorizes the Committee on Agriculture to extend the scope of its present investigating committee to this subject.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman for his correction. I know that the Committee on Agriculture will be interested in guayule. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations spoke of the fact that enough rubber is being manufactured from other sources, and I think the gentleman ought to state that in the manufacture of certain rubber commodities live rubber is necessary, and that unless you have live rubber from trees or from this plant, you do not have the correct kind of rubber.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. The real facts of the synthetic rubber program are that we are producing 30,000 tons of synthetic rubber now under the Jeffers program, and in the first quarter of 1944 we will be producing 800,000 tons under the Jeffers program, or about sufficient for our normal use. Our wartime use is about 1,200,000 tons of rubber.



Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman for that information. The point I make is that there are three factors in the proper growing of guayule. The first is rubber, which the gentleman has spoken about, and the second is the development of a new agricultural commodity in certain areas, and, third, the fact that the labor used in the guayule fields can be taken at a time which is the low period in our use of labor. Therefore, that use of labor is a fill-in between the other commodities that we grow, and therefore of great value to the agriculture program.

It was, as one gentleman said, the original intention to grow guayule by contract and not to have it placed in the hands of a Government department. It is my opinion that any criticism of the program has developed, not from anything intended in the original resolution of the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] but from features of the handling of the project by individuals or by the agency to which it was given.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. The gentleman does not mean to criticize the Forestry Service for its handling of the matter.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman wishes definitely to criticize the Forest Service, and I will give chapter and verse for everything they have done, from expenditures of money to broken promises to the farmers of California. The forestry department knew nothing about guayule and does not seem to me to care as much as it should about knowing about guayule. Many farmers in California would have been able to tell the forestry department how to grow this better than they are growing it now.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. The gentleman understands, of course, this was a war program.

Mr. PHILLIPS. This is a war program; therefore, why should it not have been put into the hands of somebody who would have been more interested in making the program successful?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Did any Government agency know anything about it?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I suggest there were people who could have done a better job than the people who have handled the program as it has been handled in some parts of California.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. But, is not the Forestry Service a part of the Department of Agriculture and evidently could have had its advice?

Mr. PHILLIPS. If so, I regret it did not take it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I do not come to criticize any individual in connection with the guayule program, but I think it has been unfortunate that there was a misunderstanding somewhere down the line as to the nature of guayule and the need for guayule. I think much of it originated in the office

of the Rubber Administration, which probably could not have been expected to be familiar with the methods of production of a crop of this kind.

Guayule is the only form of natural rubber that is produced in any quantity in the United States. It is a natural rubber. That is something that so many of us do not have in our minds. It is not synthetic rubber. It is not a substitute. Guayule is rubber. In fact that is the name—"Hay ule" means "There is rubber." That is where we got the name—from the Spaniards. It is rubber. There is rubber in the plant, just the same rubber that is grown in the trees of the South Pacific and in South America. We need that rubber to blend with synthetic rubber.

In my home town, Waco, there is a large synthetic-rubber plant being constructed to build tires. I mean to fabricate tires. They cannot fabricate those tires for large trucks and busses unless they have natural rubber to mix with the synthetic product. They must have this natural rubber. As a matter of being sure that we have the facilities to make use of the great investment that we have in synthetic-rubber plants, we must proceed to protect the one source of natural rubber that we have in continental United States. This is the guayule development.

I recognize that the committee is on solid ground when they say they were told last spring by the Rubber Administrator that we probably did not want to go so far. The Rubber Administration decided they did not need as many natural-rubber tires as they thought they needed. Now they say they are not going to get to the bottom of the bucket until next year. They had said that we would experience the greatest shortage this fall. All we can do is to change our minds along with them. I do not blame the committee for not giving them money when they said they did not need it. But now it seems we need the money which was not spent on this program last spring. Now we know that we must make extensive plantings of guayule. We have the shrubs on hand—these little slips to set out, like onion sets. Those are available to plant something like 30,000 acres in guayule rubber this fall and winter if we can get the money to put them out. If we do not put them in the field they are useless.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. Is not the weakness of this thing the fact that you can produce so little rubber with guayule; it takes 3 or 4 years to get started?

Mr. POAGE. No. That is not a weakness, because you can produce a thousand pounds per acre. It is one of the most productive forms of rubber production. In addition it does not take 4 or 5 years. Within 2 years you can produce a very worth-while crop although you can, of course, produce more per acre if you let it grow longer. The gentleman has not kept up with the guayule development. The gentleman is quoting what we thought about the guayule back

during the times we were dependent upon gathering it wild from the hills of Mexico, and when we had made no experiments with it. But even the small experiment and study we have conducted shows that guayule is not simply a shrub of old Mexico, but is a valuable commercial plant.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Is it not a fact that the time up to now has been used to produce seed and that the program is just getting started?

Mr. POAGE. And the plants are in the nurseries now. Unless they are put into the field they will not be worth any more than so many weeds, but if they are put out into the fields we will have a year's growth on those plants.

Mr. PHILLIPS. More than that.

Mr. POAGE. And another year's growth and we can start producing some rubber; but if we leave them in the nursery, we will produce nothing. If we set them out they will be producing rubber in 2 years, not 4.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. I read the hearings held by the committee and saw where producers of guayule have to harvest the whole plant and replant the shrub.

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. MAHON. That in 2 years they do get some small production of rubber.

Mr. POAGE. They get around 300 pounds an acre.

Mr. MAHON. It would seem hardly worth while.

Mr. POAGE. It is tremendously worth while to make up that 10 percent that is needed to mix with synthetic rubber to make it useful. Without that 10 percent of natural rubber you have nothing but a useless heap that might as well be clay or sawdust.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, much has been said about guayule rubber, and in the course of the debate some criticism was made of the Forestry Service. I rise at this time to say a word in behalf of a fellow Nebraskan who is in California planting guayule. I refer to Mr. Paul Roberts, the administrator of that planting program in California. If Paul Roberts makes as great a success out of the planting of guayule as he did out of the planting of trees in the Plains States, or the shelterbelt program, the guayule-planting program will be successful. I do not know what Paul Roberts has done in the way of contracts with the farmers, but I will assure you that whatever he does will be honestly done, because he is one of the most efficient, one of the most loyal and honest men I have seen. You can contact any farmer, ask any farmer in the State of Nebraska with whom Paul Roberts made a contract for trees in the shelterbelt. They were successful. They will tell you that their relations with him were most satisfactory.

I want to say another word, make another statement in behalf of another Nebraskan, and in passing I want to assure you that you are getting synthetic rubber



because of the ingenuity, the progressiveness, and the efficiency of a Nebraskan. I refer to the Honorable William Jeffers, of Nebraska, who was the Rubber Director. We are making rubber out of four products today: The byproducts of petroleum, petroleum, molasses, and alcohol. The cheapest rubber we are producing today comes from the byproducts of petroleum, the next cheapest from petroleum, the next from molasses, and the last from alcohol. The highest-priced rubber comes from South America, the next highest priced from guayule, according to information I received from the Rubber Director's office.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. In a moment, if the gentleman will permit me to proceed.

Mr. Chairman, we are producing 30,000 tons of synthetic rubber a year at the present time from our synthetic-rubber plants in which we have approximately \$750,000,000 invested. In the first quarter of 1944 we will be producing 800,000 tons of rubber, which is equal to the normal consumption of rubber in peacetimes in the United States. We need during the war approximately 1,200,000 tons of rubber. We are getting a lot of raw rubber. I say a lot because comparatively speaking it is a lot. I cannot tell you where we are getting it from, but we are getting some. During next year each essential passenger car and each essential truck will have one and one-quarter tires provided from your synthetic-rubber plants, but the majority of your synthetic rubber will go to war. The rubber picture has been made bright because of the ingenuity, as I said before, of Hon. William Jeffers. He has performed for the United States in rubber production in 1 year's time what experts tell me usually takes 10 years. There is, however, a movement on foot, Mr. Chairman, to junk the \$750,000,000 we have invested in the synthetic-rubber plants we have constructed in our country.

Unless we take heed and warning and be on guard, we are going to surrender again to the British and Dutch rubber monopolies the synthetic-rubber program which we now have in operation and which will make us independent and self-sufficient so far as rubber is concerned in peacetimes. I predict that when the war is over you will find the greatest price war in history on rubber, but the United States is now about to be self-sufficient so far as rubber is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 302. The provision of law prescribing the use of vessels of United States registry by employees of the Government traveling overseas (46 U. S. C. 1241) shall not apply to such travel during the fiscal year 1944.

#### THE REORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, for 10 years legislative power throughout the world has been in retreat. Unless the trend is checked, it

will seriously menace the continuance of representative government.

Congress has been under withering fire. Much of it has been constructive and designed to bring about improved legislative technique. Some of it has been destructive. Undue and distorted emphasis on x-cards, pensions, and bundles for Congress seemed designed to bring Congress into public disfavor and disrepute.

But when editorial writers observe that "the spectacle of Congress is anything but encouraging," or when a publicist writes that "the provincialism and ignorance of Congress makes it incapable of meeting the needs of modern government," there is time and occasion for introspection.

Why this unhappy estimate of the law-making branch of the Government? It goes back to 1933.

Distress was upon the land and the Nation clamored for remedial action. The pressures of distress can easily induce a departure from constitutional and balanced processes of government, for in the shadow there is always the profound hope that when normal conditions are restored, balanced government can be recaptured.

The pattern whereby legislative powers were usurped by the executive branch with the acquiescence of Congress needs but brief description.

First came broad grants of power. But power is an empty thing unless fortified with funds. Blank checks quickly followed. Such funds were used to create and staff the agencies to spell out those powers. Thus were the beginnings of bureaucracy laid. Grants of power to the Executive carried with them the authority to issue rules and regulations through subordinates. There began the bold expansion of administrative law carrying with it the power to punish. In some cases, courts were completely divested of jurisdiction to pass upon rules, regulations, and orders.

For a decade we functioned under that pattern. The executive branch came to regard Congress as little more than a convenient appendage of government. The virtues of a strong Executive and a weak Congress were strongly advanced. Pressure groups demeaned those Members of Congress who resisted the rising tide of Executive domination. Unbalanced party representation in Congress served to accelerate legislative decline. Frustration and a sense of futility assailed those Members who fought this trend, for they had not the tools with which to work. Radical elements who filtered into places of high executive authority labored diligently to plant the seed of distrust and suspicion. The radical press lost no opportunity to stir antagonism and ridicule.

It was a time of legislative drift and Executive mastery. And how shall the devastation to balanced government be undone?

The granted powers remain unretrieved. Volumes of regulations continue to issue forth and Congress is powerless to review them. Appropria-

tions are expended and there is no effective method for determining how wisely and efficaciously they are expended. There is still no court review of administrative decisions. Post-war problems are at hand and Congress is not now equipped to deal effectively with them.

If the Congress is to resume its proper place in a government of checks and balances, it must be staffed, weaponed, and equipped to better discharge its constitutional functions.

The problem admits of two approaches. The one is piecemeal. The other is comprehensive.

The piecemeal approach is to introduce measures to deal with each of these matters. The other is to create a Committee on Congressional Reorganization to deal with the whole matter of improving the procedures and the structure of Congress and providing it with legislative, investigatory, and supervisory tools for the better performance of its functions.

It is a monumental and imperative task. But it must be done. Such a committee could pursue this problem with diligence, avail itself of the suggestions of students and observers in this field, present a comprehensive report and perform one of the most important legislative services ever rendered since the adoption of the Constitution.

I, therefore, suggest to the membership and particularly the Rules Committee the necessity for immediate action on House Resolution 19 which I introduced in January or on some similar resolution which provides for the creation of a seven-man committee to survey, study, and investigate this whole problem of congressional reorganization, and report an over-all and inclusive program for the consideration of this body. It will be a truly progressive and forward step which will recapture representative government and bring about the efficient administration of the people's affairs.

In conjunction with these observations, I am including a copy of House Resolution 19 which I introduced on January 6, 1943:

Whereas the Congress by an act approved April 3, 1939, authorized and directed the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government and the agencies thereof to secure greater efficiency, economy, and improved service in the administration of the Federal Government; and

Whereas the expansion of Federal functions and the magnitude of the operations of the Federal Government which prompted that act make it desirable and necessary that there should also be a survey and study of the structure, function, and procedures of the legislative branch of the Federal Government for the purposes of determining, in the light of present and future problems and responsibilities, how the structure, functions, and procedures of the Congress may be modified, revised, augmented, or strengthened in the public interest and for the purpose of better enabling the Congress to discharge its constitutional responsibilities and carry out its functions; and

Whereas the scope and extent of such a survey and study make it desirable that it be undertaken by a select or special committee: Therefore be it



*Resolved*, That a special committee shall be appointed by the Speaker, to consist of seven Members of the House of Representatives, and to be designated the Select Committee on Congressional Reorganization. Said committee is hereby authorized and directed—

(a) To investigate and study the structure, functions, and procedures of the legislative branch for the purpose of determining how they may be modified, revised, and augmented so as to promote better balance between the legislative and executive branches, strengthen representative government, enable Congress the better to discharge its constitutional functions, and more effectively to supervise the performance of delegated powers, provide for a more effective use of the investigatory powers of Congress, and better equip the legislative branch with facilities and information requisite for the initiation of legislative policies.

(b) To investigate, study, and make recommendations with respect to—

(1) The creation of a joint committee of the House and Senate, or other adequate legislative instrumentality, for the more effective cooperation of the legislative branch of the Government in the conduct and prosecution of the war effort;

(2) The creation of a joint committee of House and Senate, or other adequate legislative instrumentality, to study and make recommendations for more effectively dealing with the problems of post-war planning and reconstruction, demobilization, unemployment, the utilization of our national resources and related problems;

(3) The creation of a joint committee of House and Senate, or other adequate legislative instrumentality, to study and make recommendations for more effectively dealing with the problems of peace, peace-planning, and related matters;

(4) The creation or strengthening of such legislative services or agencies as may be necessary to implement the Congress and assist it or any committee thereof to discharge more effectively its functions and responsibilities; in particular, the expansion and implementation of the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress and the other research and informational facilities of Congress with a view to their maximum usefulness;

(5) The expansion of the functions, authority, and facilities of the General Accounting Office for the purpose of securing a more effective and continuous supervision of the activities and operations of the executive departments and agencies of government in the interest of efficiency, economy, and improved public service;

(6) The creation of a joint committee of House and Senate, or other adequate legislative instrumentality, to devise ways and means of bringing about a more effective liaison between the Congress and the Budget Bureau for purposes of better control and supervision of the Budget.

Sec. 2. The committee shall make final report to the House at the earliest practicable date, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable; it may submit partial or preliminary reports and recommendations upon any separate subject of its investigation.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee or any authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions or recesses of Congress, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, documents, and records as it may deem advisable, to take testimony and to employ such clerical and stenographic help as may be necessary, all expenses, which shall not exceed \$\_\_\_\_\_, to be paid from the contingent fund of the House upon voucher of the chairman.

Sec. 3. In the event that the Senate of the United States should create a like committee for the same or similar purposes as set forth in this resolution, the committee herein created is authorized and empowered to confer and consult with such committee of the Senate, to participate in joint sessions, to join with or in any reports or recommendations submitted by such committee, and to cooperate with such committee in such manner and to such extent as will effectuate the purposes of this resolution.

#### FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The \$6,500,000 requested as direct appropriation to supplement the present \$20,000,000 for administrative purposes will enable the Farm Security Administration to hold the line for the next 8 months and do the job Congress gave it to do for the War Food Administration. The money will prevent another drastic cut in operations, a cut which would render the organization powerless to function effectively.

This \$6,500,000 now asked for will go mostly to run the local field offices out in the rural areas. So long as F. S. A. is charged with responsibility for making rehabilitation loans to needy farmers and collecting their loan payments and assisting them to become efficient operators, the county offices must stay open; men and women must be there to serve the borrowers, advise them, and help them raise the food we need.

This \$6,500,000, added to the \$20,000,000, still gives a total amount for the Administration far below last year's \$41,000,000 and the \$60,000,000 available in 1942. The \$26,500,000 will pay only for those F. S. A. operations found to be essential by the War Food Administrator. The number of employees has already been reduced from 17,000 in 1942 to 14,000 in 1943, to a little more than 10,000 now. By drastically curtailing the services formerly performed at higher administrative levels, the F. S. A. so far—through October 31—has been able to save most of its county offices. There are now about 2,000 county offices operating.

But beginning November 1—if the \$20,000,000 appropriation is not increased by at least \$6,500,000—the number of employees will be reduced to about 6,000. Most of this cut will have to be made in the local offices. About 1,000 Farm Security county offices will be closed. No supervisors will be available for great numbers of families who owe the Government and who need further assistance in good farm management before they can reasonably be expected to finish their payments. Those supervisors whose services are retained will have an average case load of 283 families, as compared with 178 now, and these families will be spread over large areas so that it will be difficult even to keep up with collections. Spread too thin, virtually no supervision will be possible. The heart and soul will be gone out of Farm Security.

From a dollars-and-cents viewpoint alone, a failure to maintain the direct appropriation for Farm Security would doubtless cost the Government far more than \$6,500,000. More than 600,000 fam-

ilies still have unmatured amounts on past loans. On last June 30, \$401,388,811 was outstanding in rehabilitation loans. This, of course, does not mean that families are not paying back satisfactorily; their repayment record is the best in the history of F. S. A. Repayments are running better than 90 percent on all rural rehabilitation loans. But if the F. S. A. offices are closed, if F. S. A. offers little or no supervision or technical help to these families who owe the Government, how much of the \$400,000,000 will be or can be paid when the maturity dates arrive? The Government's investment and the taxpayers' investment in rehabilitation funds outstanding must be adequately protected.

To curtail further the administrative budget of the F. S. A. would be folly from an investment standpoint, as well as a threat to the War Food Administration's program to get greater production from the small farmers whom F. S. A. assists.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great care this afternoon and yesterday to the arguments presented in behalf of various appropriations. I listened very carefully to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] and, like him, I had hoped that selfish interests and politics might not be brought into these appropriations, but I am compelled to accept a good many of the arguments presented as not being in good faith.

In too many cases, appropriations have been asked for and assertions made that they would shorten the war and save many lives. Certainly, we are all hoping for this.

One of the reasons that I cannot seriously accept a great many of the arguments presented is because of a letter I received from a certain newspaper publisher who presented the same sort of an argument. It so happened that last spring when newsprint was being rationed to the newspapers I wrote to a group of publishers asking for their reaction and how the cut would affect their business. I stated in that letter that the Government was using a million or more tons of paper annually, apparently, much of it for propaganda purposes.

I had a certain newspaper publisher write me immediately, stating as follows:

I notice that you are again attempting to induce people to put their selfish interests above the best interests of their Nation.

There is no reason why newspapers should not do their part. As far as the dissemination of information by the Office of War Information throughout the world is concerned, it can be as effective as bullets, something that should by all means be done, in my opinion. You may be sure that I am not interested in protecting myself to the disadvantage of the war effort, and that we will abide by any reasonable regulations those in charge of our war effort deem necessary.

If you and some of the rest of our Congressmen do not stop trying to stir up the people's selfish interests you will have a great deal to answer for in the lives of boys who otherwise might not have had to make the supreme sacrifice.

Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of argument that I have listened to here on



the floor from numerous Members from the other side of the aisle. Now, I have in my hand a statement from the War Production Board's Printing and Publishing Division giving a list of additional grants of newsprint authorized on appeal from certain newspaper publishers. These grants are over and above the fixed quotas. I find that this particular publisher in the second quarter of this year, asked for and received 20 additional tons. In the third quarter, this same publisher, asked for and received 41 additional tons. Without a doubt, he will request an additional grant for the fourth quarter.

This same newspaper publisher has a son of draft age who was classified I-A by his local draft board, and he is now enjoying his second deferment. I have never known anyone to admit that he has ever done a day's work.

After listening to the arguments and receiving a letter like this, to us who have sons and daughters in the armed forces, pleadings of this kind come with poor grace.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and, the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. SPARKMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WILSON moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Line 8, page 5, strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,000,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to explain the amendment?

The SPEAKER. No. The previous question has been ordered.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, then I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of taking the vote by the yeas and nays will rise. [After counting.] Thirteen Members have risen, not a sufficient number.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILSON there were—yeas 34, noes 172.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the vote on the ground a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and thirty-four Members are present, a quorum.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill just passed may have 5 days in which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an address by J. Edgar Hoover, in another an address by Senator FERGUSON.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Shreveport Times of Shreveport, La., under date of November 3, 1943, entitled "Investigation of Lend-Lease."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Secretary Ickes to Judge Vinson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 247), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That CLAIR ENGLE of the State of California be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Public Lands.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I do this for the purpose of asking the majority leader if he can give us any definite information as to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no program for next week. From then on, however, there will be a very heavy program.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution passed by the National Conference of Petroleum Regulatory Authorities in Washington recently.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include in several places therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

(Mr. GWYNNE and Mr. HOPE asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.



## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a thought-provoking resolution passed by the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs on the question of subsidies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a news article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. HESS (at the request of Mr. COLE, of New York), for November 4 and 5, on account of official business.

To Mr. BLAND (at the request of Mr. BURCH of Virginia), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. STARNES of Alabama (at the request of Mr. HOBBS), from November 4 to 15, on account of official business.

To Mr. WASIELEWSKI for the week beginning November 8, on account of official business.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2859. An act to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended.

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 400. An act relating to the organization and functions of the Public Health Service, and for other purposes.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, November 8, at 12 o'clock noon.

## COMMITTEE HEARINGS

## COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, November 9, 1943, for consideration of H. R. 3140.

## COMMITTEE ON PATENTS—NOTICE OF POSTPONEMENT OF MEETING

The executive session scheduled for today by the Committee on Patents was postponed until Tuesday, November 9, 1943, in the committee room, 416 House Office Building, at 10:30 a. m. Proposed legislation by the National Patent Planning Commission will be discussed.

## COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Tuesday, November 9, 1943, at 11 a. m., to resume hearings on H. J. Res. 148, a joint resolution to permit the diversion of waters from Lake Michigan to safeguard the public health.

## COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of Daylight Saving Time Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10:00 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, November 9, 1943.

Business to be considered: Hearing on H. R. 875, "To restore standard time during months of January, February, November, and December."

## COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 786, a bill to amend section 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (to include chiropractic practitioners) at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, November 10, 1943, in room 346, old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

## COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, November 10, 1943, on H. R. 2522 and 2832.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

900. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 5, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a review of reports on Buffalo Harbor, river and ship canal, New York, requested by resolutions of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on May 4, 1939, June 6, 1939, and March 26, 1940, and by resolution of the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted on May 16, 1939 (H. Doc. No. 352); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

901. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting statements in connection with the personnel requirements of the Federal Communications Commission for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3442. A bill to amend sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material, or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes," approved April 20, 1918, as amended (40 Stat. 533; U. S. C., title 50, secs. 101, 102, and 103); with amendment (Rept. No. 843). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 321. An act to facilitate and simplify collection procedure in the Department of the Interior; without amendment (Rept. No. 844). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1133. A bill for the relief of Sam Swan and Ally Swan; with amendment (Rept. No. 839). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2469. A bill for the relief of Anna Charack; with amendment (Rept. No. 840). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2999. A bill for the relief of Leo Guillo; with amendment (Rept. No. 841). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3000. A bill for the relief of Clara E. Clark; with amendment (Rept. No. 842). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3619. A bill to amend sections 675 and 676 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 5, 1901, regulating the disposal of dead human bodies in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3620. A bill to amend an act entitled, "An act to establish standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia; to define the duties of the Superintendent of Weights, Measures, and Markets, of the District of Columbia; and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1921, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3621. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the regulation of motor vehicle traffic in the District of Columbia, increase the number of judges of the police court, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. OUTLAND:

H. R. 3622. A bill to appoint a commission to settle the claims of the Indians of California; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3623. A bill to insure adequate care of disabled veterans by establishment of a per-



manent Medical Service in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 3624. A bill to validate certain applications for national service life insurance where deductions of premiums from service pay were authorized or otherwise paid but where the applicant died prior to the effective date of such insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. J. Res. 187. Joint resolution to aid in effectuating the purposes of the Railway Labor Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLEY:

H. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution for the relief of the State of Delaware; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. Con. Res. 52. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the role of a President-elect during the interim between his election and inauguration in the present emergency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings held before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives' current session on the bills (H. R. 2324, H. R. 2698, and H. R. 3015), to amend the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. Res. 346. Resolution providing for an investigation of the program for the planting of guayule to serve as a domestic source of crude rubber; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 3625. A bill for the relief of Alvin W. Twigg; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 3626. A bill to validate the application for national service life insurance of Jerome J. Simandi, late major, Army Air Forces; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. HARRIS of Virginia:

H. R. 3627. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frances Sims; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3628. A bill for the relief of Max Kanarenstein; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MICHENER:

H. R. 3629. A bill for the relief of Wilfrid Verl Wilson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3630. A bill for the relief of Peter Paul Bacic, Charles C. Cox, H. Forest Haugh, and Luther M. Durst; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3440. By Mr. THOMASON: Petition of sundry residents of Odessa, Tex., advocating passage of House bill 2082, a bill prohibiting manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3441. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Irvin Smith, president, Christian Missionary Workers of the Central Christian Church, of Fairmont, W. Va., urging the passage of

House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3442. By Mr. LEWIS of Ohio: Resolution passed at a meeting of the Christian churches of East Liverpool on the 17th day of August 1943, opposing the manufacture, transportation, and sale of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3443. Also, petition of Mrs. H. R. Davy and Alice V. James, of Delroy, Ohio, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3444. Also, petition of Linnie G. Simpson and 59 other residents of New Athens, St. Clairsville, and Cadiz, Ohio, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3445. Also, petition of Mrs. C. L. Imhoff and 57 other residents of Bellaire, Ohio, and vicinity, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3446. Also, petition of the Ladies Bible Class of the Presbyterian Church of Lisbon, Ohio, opposing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3447. Also, petition of Mrs. M. L. Lowry and 37 other teachers of the public schools of Toronto, Jefferson County, Ohio, opposing increase of taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3448. Also, petition of Florence Harshman and 28 other residents of Mingo Junction, Ohio, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3449. Also, petition of Chester H. Dean and 28 other residents of Mingo Junction, Ohio, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3450. Also, petition of Mrs. Carl Berg and 81 other residents of East Liverpool, Ohio, urging immediate action on further restriction and control of the liquor traffic in the vicinity of our armed camps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3451. Also, petition of Charles Besozzi and 98 other residents of Lansing, Ohio, and nearby villages, protesting against enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3452. Also, petition of Jared E. Davis and 80 other residents of Martins Ferry, Ohio, and nearby villages, protesting against enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3453. Also, petition of Forest Walters and 39 other residents of Carrollton, Ohio, and nearby villages, protesting against enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3454. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Orville Fricke and 40 other St. Louis citizens protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3455. Also, petition of William Frank and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3456. Also, petition of Louis Van Mierlo and 18 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3457. Also, petition of the United Garment Workers Local Union No. 67, and signed by 21 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3458. Also, petition of Mrs. J. A. Fink and 23 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3459. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 35 members and adherents of the Mahoning United Presbyterian Church, New Castle, Pa., urging the passage of all bills now before the House to prohibit the advertisement of alcoholic beverages, to ban beer and liquor sales at military and naval canteens, to make it unlawful to furnish alcoholic beverages to anyone in uniform, and to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and transportation of all alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3460. By Mr. ELSTON of Ohio: Petitions of the Clyffside Brewing Co., and 20 other residents of Cincinnati; H. Dennert Distributing Co., and 133 other residents of Cincinnati; Edwin Wulffhorst and 19 other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3461. Also, petitions of Howard Sullivan, Michael Taylor, John J. Beck, C. A. DuBois, Carl Ludwig, Carl Chaney, Harry W. Swift, Clarence Nienaher, Walter A. Willis, Walter Burden, J. H. McCutcheon, R. L. Slomer, Charles Doll, Henry Frederick, Charles H. Hahn, H. W. Coy, Louis C. Rieger, Mary McRoberts, James E. Hickey, Herbert B. Robb, E. C. Fischer, Pat Dowell, Albert Stone, William Downson, Nicholas Diehl, Henry Westermann, Joseph Ullman, and 512 other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3462. Also, petitions of Harry Bickers, Harold Hilge, Howard Garrett, Ralph G. Herbold, Mary Waechter, Frank Herrman, Nicholas Draginoff, Edward J. Donnelly, Mrs. Fred H. Dress, Marguerite Doerger, Herbert Wood, Albert H. Meyer, Charles J. Due, W. E. Prost, Richard W. Fischer, Meda M. Ketterer, Edward J. Krieger, George J. Kopp, Alethia V. Schaefer, F. J. Brading, William Book, John J. Behrmann, Charles Wagner, Stanley J. Humbert, Burton C. Drayer, Albert Spaulding, Mrs. Fred Benzinger, R. C. Flanagan, Edward Gehring, Joseph Stoeppelman, Robert E. Smith, and 529 other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3463. By Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania: Petition of H. A. Wagner and 1,006 other residents of Luzerne County, requesting the defeat of House bill 3420, the Lea bill, affecting air commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3464. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Omer Moore and 16 other citizens of Corvallis, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3465. By Mr. LEFEVRE: Petition signed by 43 parishioners of the Central Bridge Methodist Church, Central Bridge, N. Y., petitioning the Congress to pass House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3466. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 23 qualified voters of the city of Butler, Pa., urging the adoption and final passage of House Resolution 117, to permit shipment of food to those unfortunate children residing in occupied countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3467. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of A. F. Mitchell, Mrs. Glynn Mitchell Johnston, W. H. Smith, Mr. and Mrs. M. J. McClure, Lillian McClure, Robert G. Dillard, Joe E. Butler, John C. Calhoun, and E. C.



Bowen, favoring House bill 106; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3468. By Mr. KING: Resolution of the San Pedro Typographical Union, No. 862, of San Pedro, Calif., relative to a wage adjustment; to the Committee on Printing.

3469. By Mr. LANE: Petition of the mayor and city council of the city of Chelsea, Mass., concerning Senate bill 1163; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Jacob S. Payton, D. D., of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we bow in reverence before Thee whose name is hallowed, whose judgments are true and righteous altogether, and whose love is unfailing. For Thy mercies which have followed us all the days of our lives we offer praise and thanksgiving. The evidences of Thy beauty we have seen in lives that have blessed us, and we have recognized Thy fatherly care in delivering us from many evils and misfortunes.

Hear our prayer, O Lord, for America. While her sons are offering up their lives in battle and many homes are becoming the abodes of anxiety and sorrow, we pray that the spirit of the Lord may visit our land in all its comforting power. Rescue our citizens from their follies, redeem them from their iniquities, and cleanse them from all uncleanness that thereby America may be made precious in Thy sight because of her righteousness.

As these Thy servants stand upon the threshold of another week, grant them discernment of such means as will contribute to a world in which Thy precepts shall be honored. Here may they indicate the direction in which America should move that her citizens may become abundant in good works and that her devotion to the teachings of Thy Son may serve as an example to the nations. We offer our prayer in the name of Jesus Christ, our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, November 5, 1943, was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insist upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 2188) entitled "An act to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. BRIDGES to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SEÑOR DON PEDRO CASTELBLANCO AGUERO

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, we have the honor today of having with us Señor

Don Pedro Castelblanco Aguero, president of the Chilean Chamber of Deputies. He has presented to the Speaker of the House of Representatives a message from the Chamber of Deputies of Chile. I ask unanimous consent that the message be read to the House at this time by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES OF CHILE.  
To the American Congresses:

By the intermediary of the president of the corporation, Señor Don Pedro Castelblanco Aguero, formulates its most fervent votes of American brotherhood.

It anxiously desires that his journey may strengthen and translate, into positive and concrete accomplishments, the ideals and aspirations of spiritual and economic unity animating all the countries of the continent.

The Chamber of Deputies of Chile, which has had a long and more than century-old tradition of democracy, hopes that by the common action of the American nations there may be obtained full confirmation of the principles of democracy and liberty.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House of Representatives, I desire to thank the president of the legislature of our great sister republic of Chile for bringing us this message, and to welcome him, not only to this House of Representatives but to the city of Washington and to the United States.

### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll. No. 156]

Anderson, Calif.	Dingell	Jones
Andrews	Ditter	Judd
Baldwin, Md.	Douglas	Kearney
Barden	Drewry	Kee
Barry	Durham	Kennedy
Bates, Mass.	Elmer	Keogh
Beckworth	Engel, Mich.	Kerr
Bell	Fay	Kilburn
Bender	Fenton	Kleberg
Blackney	Fernandez	Klein
Bland	Fitzpatrick	Lambertson
Boren	Fogarty	Lane
Bradley, Mich.	Ford	Lea
Bradley, Pa.	Fulmer	LeFevre
Brehm	Furlong	McGregor
Brooks	Gallagher	McLean
Brown, Ohio	Gamble	McMurray
Buckley	Gavagan	Maas
Burchill, N. Y.	Gayin	Madden
Busbey	Gerlach	Magnuson
Butler	Gifford	Marcantonio
Byrne	Gillie	Martin, Iowa
Camp	Gore	Merritt
Cannon, Fla.	Gorski	Miller, Pa.
Capozzoli	Hale	Morrison, La.
Carter	Hall	Mott
Chapman	Leonard W.	Murphy
Chenoweth	Halleck	Myers
Clason	Harness, Ind.	Norton
Cole, N. Y.	Hart	O'Brien, Ill.
Compton	Hébert	O'Connor
Costello	Heffernan	O'Leary
Courtney	Hendricks	O'Toole
Crawford	Herter	Pace
Cullen	Hess	Peterson, Ga.
Curley	Holmes, Mass.	Pfeifer
D'Alesandro	Izac	Philbin
Davis	Jackson	Ploeser
Dawson	Jennings	Pracht
Dies	Johnson	Rabaut
	J. Leroy	Randolph

Rees, Kans.  
Robison, Ky.  
Rogers, Calif.  
Rowan  
Sabath  
Sadowski  
Sasscer  
Satterfield  
Scanlon  
Scott  
Shafer  
Sheridan  
Short

Sikes  
Slaughter  
Smith, Maine  
Smith, Va.  
Smith, W. Va.  
Somers, N. Y.  
Starnes, Ala.  
Steagall  
Sundstrom  
Taber  
Taylor  
Thomas, N. J.  
Towe

Vincent, Ky.  
Wasielewski  
West  
Wheat  
Wheelchel, Ga.  
White  
Willey  
Winstead  
Winter  
Wolcott  
Zimmerman

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 270 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT L. DOUGHTON

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker speaking for the whole delegation of my State, and for the whole people of North Carolina, I ask the Members to suspend their labors for a brief while, in order that we may do honor on the anniversary of the birthday of a model man, one of the greatest patriots my State ever contributed to this Republic. In the northwest corner of my State there is a region known for centuries as the Lost Province. It is so beautiful that only a poet could describe it, but until a few decades ago it was shut off and pent up by lack of transportation to other parts of the world. Without railroad facilities, without dirt roads, the people had lived there because they loved its beauty, the grandeur of its mountains, the beauty of its sunsets and sunrises. They had grown a great, brave people, but they had had few of the modern facilities for development. They were blessed however in rearing in those surroundings, two great men, brothers, who were to lead them from their hard environment, and by bringing modern conveniences and opportunities to make it such, there is a land that is fairer than day, and I wish by faith that I could make you see it from afar. They commenced to move along every line that Christians and patriots move, and today they are blessed with the finest rural schools in the land, roads that are as up to date and superb as any in the Republic, and with one of the happiest people ever found in all the world.

In 1908 one of these men, unknown to the State at large, a businessman, a farmer, a trader in livestock, moved about the people, and without being a candidate or desiring it, in spite of himself, the party to which he belonged, nominated him for the State Senate. He accepted the nomination in a Senatorial district overwhelmingly Republican, and commenced a campaign unlike any other I have ever heard of in my life. He moved among the people with great celerity. The roads were impassable a great deal of the time, and still when his mode of conveyance broke down, he walked from county site to county site. He engaged in discussion unlike any ever heard before in that part of the country.

Without oratorical blandishments, without large literary attainments, he moved among the people and in their